TWO COMEDIES BY APOLLODORUS OF CARYSTUS

MNEMOSYNE
BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

SUPPLEMENTUM PRIMUM

TWO COMEDIES BY APOLLODORUS OF CARYSTUS

TERENCE'S HECYRA AND PHORMIO

BY

W. E. J. KUIPER
PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1938

*PA3870
A94 K9

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

146925
6-9-39

σὴν χάριν εὐχομένῳ, θυμέλης χάρις ὦ Διόνυσε,
ἐκ μακάρων νήσων 'πέμψας ἐμοὶ Ἑκυράν.
τῆς δὲ λύσιν δοῦναι τί μάτην σ' αἰτήσομ', Ἀγυιεῦ;
ἦλθε γὰρ ἐξ ἐνέρων οὐπιδικαζόμενος.

PREFACE

The present book is a continuation, and, if it is considered as a treatise on Terence's work, a supplement of the author's investigations of Greek Originals and Latin Imitations, *which appeared in 1936*[1]. *That book was written in Dutch with a detailed Summary in English. Its aim was to reconstruct six comedies of Menander, both with regard to form and contents, from the plays of Terence and Plautus. These comedies are* **Εὐνοῦχος, Ἑαυτὸν Τιμωρούμενος, Ἀνδρία** *and* Ἀδελφοί, *adapted by Terence in his plays of the same name, and* **Συναριστῶσαι** *and* **Δὶς ἐξαπατῶν,** *adapted by Plautus in his* Cistellaria *and* Bacchides.

In a similar way, and following up the results of the former investigations, the author now tries to reconstruct the old form of Apollodorus' **Ἑκυρά** *and* **Ἐπιδικαζόμενος,** *by means of an analysis of Terence's* Hecyra *and* Phormio.

---

1) *Griekshe Origineelen en Latijnsche Navolgingen. Zes Komedies van Menander bij Terentius en Plautus.* Verhand. Kon. Akad. v. Wetensch. Afd. Letterk. XXXVIII No. 2. N.V. Noord-Hollandsche U.Mij 1936.

I

THE ORIGINAL OF TERENCE'S HECYRA [1])

As early as 1839 Meineke in his *Historia Critica Comicorum Graecorum* [2]) ascribed the Greek Ἑκυρά, which was the model of Terence's play of the same name, to Apollodorus of Carystus, and thus disregarded the authority of the Latin *didascalia,* where it says: "T o t a G r a e c a M e n a n d r u". Meineke refers to Donatus, who, both in the *Auctarium* on Suetonius's *Vita Terenti* and in his commentary, mentions Apollodorus as Terence's source; he also states that *"in antiquis exemplaribus"* Pighius has found an ancient *didascalia,* where the words "t o t a g r a e c a A p o l l o d o r u" are found, but this statement is not corroborated by the manuscripts. However, the accepted view at present is that the model of the *Hecyra* was not a piece by Menander. Nencini's [3]) attempt to prove the reverse is generally considered to be a failure [4]), the enlightened insight into Menander's art, which was obtained from the new fragments, emphatically refutes that attribution. In the 2nd edition of his *Plautinische Forschungen* [5]) Leo

[1]) The number of writings in which the original of Terence's *Hecyra* has been thoroughly examined is comparatively small. I mention here: F. Hildebrandt, *De Hecyrae Terentianae origine,* Halle 1884 (Thesis). Georges Lafaye, *Le modèle de Térence dans l'Hécyre,* Revue de Philologie XL, 1916, pp. 18—32. W. Schadewaldt, *Bemerkungen zur Hecyra des Terenz,* Hermes LXVI, 1931, pp. 1—29. Hildebrandt's conclusion that Terence has confined himself to one source in his adaptation, the *Hekyra* by Apollodorus, has been generally accepted since the discovery of the *Epitrepontes.* (See Schanz-Hosius, *Röm. Lit. Gesch.* I, p. 110). — Lafaye writes that even Terence himself was not quite sure as to who was the author of his model, Apollodorus or Menander. He thinks that the abridgment noted by Donatus *ad v. 825* was not made by Terence until after his initial failure. — It is not necessary to give a summary of Schadewaldt's conclusions here as they will be mentioned incidentally in the following pages.

For a full bibliography see Jachmann, *R.E.,* Va, s.v. *Terentius.*

[2]) p. 464.

[3]) *De Terentio eiusque fontibus* (1891), p. 51.

[4]) Schanz-Hosius, *Röm. Lit. Gesch.* I, p. 110.

[5]) 1912, p. 141 A 2.

speaks of the "anti-menandrical portraying of the characters" in the *Hecyra.*

But this does not settle the matter for everyone. Without vindicating the Greek *Hekyra* for Menander again, Karl Kunst in his *Studien zur griechisch-römischen Komödie* [1]), expresses his doubt about the attribution to Apollodorus, because Donatus hints that there is some uncertainty in this respect, while Eugraphius writes in his commentary as follows: "Non omnes comoediae Terenti a Menandro videntur esse translatae, nam haec, quae Hecyra est, alterum Graecum habet auctorem. Quis ille sit, habetur incertum: alii<..., alii> Apollodorum volunt" [2]). In my opinion Kunst's reasoning is hardly convincing. He states that Donatus writes in the *Praefatio* of the *Hecyra* [3]): "Haec fabula Apollodori dicitur esse Graeca, nam et ipsa et Phormio ab eodem dicuntur esse translatae, cum reliquae quattuor sint Menandri comici". As Donatus mentions the name of Apollodorus in his *Praefatio* of the *Phormio* [4]) without any restriction, it follows—according to Kunst—that the careful reserve of the *"dicuntur"* in the *Praefatio* of the *Hecyra* refers exclusively to the *Hecyra.* The same "carefulness" is observed by Donatus in the *Auctarium* of the *Vita* [5]), from which Kunst quotes these words: "Duae ab Apollodoro translatae esse dicuntur comico, Phormio et Hecyra". But Kunst gives the last quotation incomplete; the text of the *Vita* continues: "quattuor reliquae a Menandro". Consequently, the *"d i c u n t u r translatae esse"* applies to these four as well. It is clear that Donatus does not express doubt with his *"dicuntur"*, but indicates a generally accepted opinion. That he himself keeps to that opinion, also with regard to the *Hecyra,* is obvious from the fact that he repeatedly mentions the name of Apollodorus in his commentary when quoting verses from the original [6]). Whether Eugraphius's opinion was different is questionable. It is dangerous to draw conclusions from a text whose *lacunae* have been removed. For every one is free to fill up the gap as he pleases. If we quote from Eugraphius: „Quis ille sit, habetur incertum: alii <alium>

[1]) 1919, p. 95. For Lafaye's opinion see p. 1, note 1.
[2]) See Aeli Donati *Commentum Terenti,* ed. Wessner, III, 1, p. 259.
[3]) *O.c.* II p. 189, 1, 1.
[4]) *Ibid.,* p. 345, 1, 1.
[5]) *Vita Terenti* 9 W.
[6]) Ad versus 58, 214, 286, 380.

Apollodorum volunt", he appears to leave his readers this choice: Apollodorus Carystius, Apollodorus Gelous or Apollodorus Atheniensis, three comedians of whom, it is true, the last-mentioned is fictitious, but occurred in ancient literary history, as appears from Suidas [1]).

We may assume that, when Donatus spoke of Apollodorus, he meant the Carystian, so that we can get an idea of his art from two Latin imitations. But this does not mean that the image we get when reading the *Phormio* becomes clearer and is corroborated when we read the *Hecyra*. For, although it must be admitted that the weak points of these two plays display a certain similarity, apart from that they are different to a high degree, both in character and in style. The *Hecyra* is a slow piece, the *Phormio* is full of life and motion. Here the *"servus currens"* Geta seems to set the pace, in the *Hecyra* the slow Parmeno, who, in his exclusive rôle of half-reluctant messenger more frequently crawls than walks. The clever, enterprising Geta spurs on the action of the *Phormio;* due to him, to the short-tempered Demipho, to the two restless lovers and the ready-witted sycophant the comedy has become a play of intrigues and surprises, in which the poet has purposely kept behind the curtain practically everything that is not action itself, but consideration and preparation. But in the *Hecyra,* a play about old people and a youth who is sorely tried, the action proceeds only slowly, struggling on as it does in a flow of consultation, argument, refutation, dissimulation, reflection, reasoning, after-consideration. There is no play by Terence, in which people are trying so hard to solve their problems as here, in which they are so brimful of wordly wisdom, which is in evidence in *sententiae.* Neither is there a play in which the number of *versus septenarii* and *octonarii* is so very large. The *Hecyra* is a drama of sentiment and sensibility, of the teaching of duty and struggle of conscience; it is one protracted debate, in which action is mostly the result of newly arisen suspicions regarding secret and unforeseen intentions, whereas it is seldom due to new facts. And if we had to point out in what respect this drama, which, as Wilamowitz says, *"auf Rührung hinaus will"* [2]), resembles the

[1]) S.v. **Ἀπολλόδωρος.** He mentions Apollodorus Carystius s.v. **ἐγκομβώσασθαι.** [2]) Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht,* p. 134.

Phormio, we could not mention much apart from the weakness of the characterization. Their common characteristic is a lack of precision and poverty of detail with their concomitant inconsistency and a tendency to repetition. These are faults which will certainly not have to be attributed to the translator, but to Apollodorus himself. If he is to be judged from these two plays, he must have been an artist without a strong, individual personality, an imitator who was easily influenced by others. This will be the cause of his writing a comedy after the theme of Menander's *Kolax,* in which unscrupulousness reigned supreme. It also explains why he utilized a motif from Menander's *Epitrepontes,* in order to make a drama which, due to the very self-conscious nobility of the characters, reminds the reader of the *Thesaurus* by Philemon, Plautus's *Trinummus.* The *"Ehrenrettung"* of the Mother-in-law and of the *Meretrix* may be a support of Menander's thesis that "appearances are deceptive", in this play appearances are too transparent to be called deceptive. Terence may have emphasized those tests, he has not made them. Therefore he may at most have somewhat enlarged the distance that already existed between the originals of *Hecyra* and *Phormio.* In both plays *Tyche* intertwines the threads and then disentangles them to a happy end. But in the *Phormio* lies, cunning, deceit, intimidation and blackmail are her only means; in the *Hecyra* compassion, integrity, compliancy, sense of duty, discretion, sensitiveness and noble-mindedness are the human motives by means of which she obtains her end. This cannot have been different in the Greek originals.

It is certain that there was agreement between the Latin and the Greek *Hekyra* as far as ethical character goes. But are we to conclude from this that they were also alike in every other respect? I believe not. For similarity in character does not imply agreement of form. There is, on the contrary, every reason to surmise that, due to Terence's adaptation Apollodorus's comedies have undergone the same changes as the four plays derived from Menander. For we see that the elements of the dramatic narrative are the same in every one of these six imitations. Thence it follows, in the first place, that Apollodorus did not deviate from Menander with regard to the ele-

ments. Further we know that, wherever Terence interpreted Menander for the Roman stage, he employed the traditional elements of his dramatic art in a certain way; he has greatly restricted the function of some of those elements and thus diminished the importance of the *anagnorisis* and of the inanimate means of recognition. We also know that Apollodorus has worked in Menander's spirit and can almost be considered as one of his disciples. So it is unacceptable that he did agree with the master as regards the contents and components of his *fabula,* but did not agree with him as regards the grouping of the events, the line of action, the composition. Accordingly Terence has adapted the plays by Apollodorus in a similar way as those by Menander, while these Greek plays resembled each other, also in their composition. One and the same mirror, Terence, gives us a reflection of six Greek plays; those reflections resemble each other; it follows that the originals in front of the mirror must have resembled each other. The same proportion which the Greek *Eunouchos* bears to the Latin one must also exist between the two *Hekyrai.* If this equation is correct, there is every chance that it also holds good for Apollodorus's **Ἐπιδικαζόμενος** and its imitation, the *Phormio,* just as, conversely, the reconstruction of that play may enhance the degree of certainty of the results obtained for the **Ἑκυρά.**

Accordingly, I wish, first of all, to investigate Terence's *Hecyra* thoroughly. Before proceeding to that, however, it will be useful to give a summary of the contents of this drama, in which a well-known theme of the **Νέα** has been elaborated: a young woman marries the man who has previously committed indecent assault against her and has procreated a child with her, while remaining unknown to her. The story may be summarized thus.

After a liaison of many years with Bacchis, Pamphilus, at the instigation of his father, Laches, marries a neighbour's daughter, Philumena, the daughter of Phidippus and Myrrina. His aversion to wedlock, however, at first takes the form of aversion to his wife, but after a lapse of time Philumena succeeds in winning his affection by her kindness and tact, patience and gentleness. Shortly after the marriage has thus been consummated, Pamphilus has to go to *Imbros* to attend to matters connected with an inheritance. His wife

stays, under the care of her mother-in-law, Sostrata, whereas Laches, her father-in-law, prefers to stay at his country-seat. Due to an inscrutable cause there arises an estrangement between the two women, which ultimately leads to Philumena flying to the parental home, and to her refusing to return under pretexts not to be verified, the last of which is "illness". The real reason, her pregnancy, which she wishes to conceal, is known only to herself and her mother, Myrrina. Her father, Phidippus, does not know, but is resigned. Next Laches, having heard about the undesirable state of things, all of a sudden comes to town and jumps to a conclusion: the unbearable temper of his wife is the cause of everything. The next morning (the day on which the play is enacted) Pamphilus returns unexpectedly and entering the house and the room where Philumena is by surprise, he discovers the real cause without delay: his wife expects a child, she is nearly the mother of a child of whom he is not the father. Her very secrecy proves her guilt, even if he should have forgotten when their marital intercourse began, which, however, he has not forgotten. And Myrrina, Philumena's mother, confesses the fact to him, but beseeches him to observe silence; the child shall be removed and Philumena be divorced. Pamphilus assents and promises to observe the secret. But meanwhile the respective fathers have started to bring about a reconciliation, and try to remove the objections raised by Pamphilus and Myrrina. At length they think they have found the real cause of their opposition: Bacchis. Apparently Myrrina opposes a reconciliation and Pamphilus wishes a divorce, because his relation with Bacchis still continues. In order to put a stop to this for good and all, the fathers send for Bacchis. But Bacchis declares on oath that that relation has been broken for a long time. Full of joy they send her to Myrrina's house in order to repeat her declaration before the two women. And then Myrrina discovers on Bacchis's finger, the ring which Philumena lost shortly before her marriage, in the nocturnal adventure which had been the cause of her pregnancy. How did Bacchis get that ring? A present from Pamphilus! The problem is solved. Bacchis goes out again, and at once sends for Pamphilus saying that the ring which he had given her, has turned out to be Philumena's. Pamphilus appears and thanks his rescuer. He and Bacchis agree

that this beautiful secret is not to be disclosed to the other members of the family, and the play is over.

What is most striking about the construction of this *fabula?* It is this: that the key of the solution, though it appears momentarily in verse 574, is not offered to the hearer or reader before the last act, at most 70 verses before the end of the play [1]. The audience remain ignorant of the secret on which the complications of this comedy are based for a longer time than anywhere else in Terence's work. In fact there is no Latin comedy which resembles a modern drama so much and the Attic examples so little in this respect. Can we be surprised that a "prologue" has been postulated here for the Greek original? Wilamowitz is still guarded in his words [2], but Tenney Frank [3] and Schadewaldt [4] are firmly convinced that Terence has cancelled a detailed "prologue" from his example. Jachmann [5], too, is perfectly sure of this: the secret must have been revealed to the spectators before the beginning of the play. And if there is no doubt about that, then it is easy to say, I think, where this revelation was placed. It was the disclosure of an absolute secret, so it was made by a *deus ex machina*; accordingly it must have followed the exposition of the persons [6]. And indeed that monologue by the god may be easily imagined after the last scene of the 1st act, which consequently must have had a length of nearly 200 verses in Apollodorus's play, and not some 140 verses, as in Terence's [7].

[1]) The *Hecyra* numbers 880 verses, in verses 811 f. the spectator hears where the ring mentioned in verse 574 has remained, in verses 822—32 he learns everything about it.

[2]) Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht* (1925), p. 148.

[3]) Am. Journ. Phil. 1928, pp. 307 ff.

[4]) Hermes 1931, pp. 1 ff. Schadewaldt starts from verses 572—74, which in his opinion do not fit in the context because of their *"Ethos"*, and have apparently been inserted by Terence at this point of the play as a small compensation for the "prologue" from which they have been derived. In my opinion these verses are original, but had a different background in Apollodorus's play; I shall discuss this later (See p. 40). However, the proof for the "prologue" may be constructed even without these verses.

[5]) Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.* Va, 598 ff.

[6]) See W. E. J. Kuiper, *Gr. Origin. en Lat. Navolg.*, pp. 12 f.

[7]) Schadewaldt thinks (Hermes 1931, p. 24 [2])), that verses 114—170 of Parmeno's exposition have been derived from the god's "prologue". This is

Was this, however, the only structural difference between Terence and his Greek predecessor? To my mind this is not the case. The conclusion of the *Hecyra* is not in accordance with the practice of the Greek drama. The play has, so to say, no or hardly any *exodos*. To put it differently: it lacks the careful development of matters quietly put forth with all kinds of detail after the *anagnori-*

certainly erroneous, for two reasons. 1. Unless the secret of Pamphilus's heart is disclosed by Parmeno's exposition, verses 327, 359—60, 409—14, 430—43 hang in the air. So if it was Terence who gave verses 114—170 to Parmeno, the whole of the rest of Parmeno's rôle, i.e. his rôle of an undesired and eliminated witness, would be Terence's creation. Since the latter is impossible, the former is likewise impossible. 2. What Parmeno relates in 114—170 is not a secret of the god-person, but of a human person, Pamphilus. It is preferable that the audience should learn this from the human person, for the latter will adapt his behaviour in the action to what he knows or thinks he knows. But Pamphilus is not present. (Cf. the *Andria*, verses 215 ff.). Therefore he speaks by the mouth of his slave, who had been informed in an evil hour, and to whom the disclosure of those intimacies was infinitely better suited because of his vulgarity and indiscretion, which is an unmistakable advantage. — It becomes obvious now how Parmeno's rôle or rather his lack of rôle between 443 and 799 is the logical conclusion of his flippancy and indiscretion. He knows too much; therefore he is immediately sent away by Pamphilus when the latter discovers something new in connection with the secret. To put it differently: The poet puts him in a blind alley during the enaction of the complication, because he might endanger it.

Some critics think, equally erroneously in my opinion, that a change may be proved by the manner in which the names of Sostrata and Philumena are mentioned in verses 179 and 191, "as if the spectators knew them from a previous scene". (Th. Ladewig, *Beiträge z. Kritik des Terenz*, p. 8). This way of communicating the names to the audience is indeed nothing else but "manner". And this manner is applied in the exposition with great consistency. See: 1. Verse 58 *meretrix*, verse 59 *amator*, mentioned in inverted order in verse 60 as Pamphilus and Bacchis. 2. Verse 116 *pater* (Pamphili), verse 121 *pater (illius)*, verse 123 *senex*, mentioned by name in verse 134: Laches. (Philotis knows Pamphilus well, so she also knows his father's name). 3. Verse 174 *mater* (Pamphili) and *uxor* (Pamphili), in 179 the name of Sostrata follows; this name is a traditional one in Comedy for an elderly woman, Philotis knows Pamphilus well, so she also knows his mother's name, Parmeno speaks about his mistress; consequently neither the audience nor the characters could be in doubt as to who was meant. 4. Verse 124 *gnata vicini*, later on passim *uxor, virgo*, verse 174 *uxor* (Pamphili), verse 188 *mulier* = *uxor* P., called by her name, Philumena, as late as verse 191.

sis, that traditional ultimate development, which we know from the fragments of the *Epitrepontes* and the *Perikeiromene,* which is found in the *Heauton Timorumenos,* which appeared to have been partly expunged and changed by the Latin playwright in the *Adelphoi* and the *Eunouchos,* and which could be reconstructed, though of course only in a general way, in the *Andria,* the *Synaristosai* and the *Dis Exapaton* [1]. Considering that, in the *Cistellaria* (Menander's *Synaristosai),* Plautus does not need 15 verses to conclude his play, that in the *Andria* (Terence's oldest work) Terence uses the 35 verses following the *anagnorisis* for the greater part in order to finish his contamination-case of Charinus, we may conclude that it is probable that in the *Hecyra,* too, — which is only a year younger than the *Andria* — he still made short work of the old *exodos* [2]. If we compare this comedy with the schemes of Menander's six plays, which I have reconstructed from the Latin imitations [3], we see at once that the 5th act is almost entirely missing. This may even be seen without a comparison. We read it in the text of the *Hecyra* itself. For 15 verses before the end Pamphilus says: [4]

placet non fieri hoc itidem ut in comoediis,
Omnia omnes ubi resciscunt.

But — the reader may be inclined to ask — from what does it appear that Terence is speaking here in his own name? Is it not possible that he translates these words from his source, so that his conclusion is in conformity with that of Apollodorus? [5] For the

[1]) For the 5 last plays see: *Gr. Origin. en Lat. Navolg.*

[2]) The *Andria* dates from the year 166; the *Hecyra,* which had been put on the stage in 165 for the first time and without success, was performed for the 2nd and 3nd times in 160, in a changed form according to some scholars (e.g. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* 236 [2]). This view cannot be proved at the hand of available data, I think.

[3]) *O.c.,* after p. 294.

[4]) Verses 866—67.

[5]) This opinion is expressed i.a. by K. Kunst, *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Komödie,* p. 98. A. Thierfelder, *Die Motive der griech. Kom. im Bewusstsein ihrer Dichter* (Hermes 1936, p. 320) considers this move as an innovation by Apollodorus, a protest against the verbosity of current practice. I hope to prove that it is Terence's protest and at the same time—like so many

moment I admit this possibility and do not wish to emphasize those elements too much which weaken it. So I do not say that Pamphilus's effort is vain, because Myrrina can certainly not have succeeded in concealing from her husband something so important that has taken place in his own house and during his presence [1]. For I admit that, if there remained nothing for Apollodorus's development but a repetition of what was already known, he might have avoided that awkward task by means of a witty makeshift, just as Terence. No more shall I allege Donatus's note to verse 825 — *"brevitati consulit Terentius"* — as a proof that Terence has expunged the development, for this note concerns a scene between Bacchis and Pamphilus, that is a scene of the *anagnorisis,* not a scene of the development, for then Laches and Phidippus, perhaps also Sostrata, by the side of Pamphilus should have been mixed up in it. But I do assert that this abridgment of the *anagnorisis,* which was at once an abridgment and a radical change, may have caused the expunction of the old conclusion, that is to say of the 5th act, and that as a direct result. However, the question whether this result was not only possible but also necessary and consequently real, we shall not be able to settle before we know what has been abridged and changed in that scene between Pamphilus and Bacchis. Therefore this scene, to which Donatus's *"brevitati consulit Terentius"* refers, has first to be reconstructed into its original state. But we shall not be able to do this before we know in which act of the Greek **Ἑκυρά** it occurred. For "act" meant "a phase of the action", so that the character of an act determined the nature of its scenes. It follows that our first task is to fix the dividing lines of the Greek acts in the series of scenes forming Terence's *Hecyra.* Only the determination of the old divisions of the acts forms, I think, a reliable basis for an analysis of the Latin *Hecyra* and a reconstruction of the Greek *Hekyra.*

protests—an apology. His ultimate development could not have become anything but a repetition of what was already known, with a series of faces full of astonishment and joy as the only valuable result.

[1]) See verses 869 ff.:

B a c. Immo etiam qui hoc occultari facilius credas dabo.
Myrrina ita Phidippo dixit, iuri iurando meo
Se fidem habuisse et propterea te sibi purgatum.

Terence's *Hecyra,* just as his *Andria* [1]), may be played without interludes, if this be preferred. Yet there is one point where one would like to have an entr'acte, I mean between verses 798 and 799. In the Terence-MSS. [2]) no interlude is denoted here — at 798 V 2 ends, at 799 V 3 commences —, and if we are so inclined and make ample concession to "stage-convention" we might say that the 5 verses said by Laches (794—98) together with the 8 with which Parmeno comes on (799—806), are sufficient — if need be — to explain the duration of Bacchis's visit to Myrrina and Philumena [3]). But this "if need be" is almost a negation. We do not know what Terence himself wished; the division of the ancient grammarians, which has been preserved in the *codices,* is far from judicious. Consequently there is every reason to assume that the modern editors who insert an entr'acte here are right, and likewise every reason to assume that the Greek model, too, had an entr'acte here.

On the other hand it may be remarked that the points where the ancient grammarians thought a pause necessary, as appears from the division that has come down to us, (after 197, 280, 515, 726), are most unsuitable, as far as the last two cases go, for interludes. Accordingly the editors who substitute a new division for the one that has come down to us, discard the entr'actes after 515 and 726 and thus divide the play in to 5 acts [4]):

I. Exposition, verses 58—197.
II. Deliberation of Laches, Sostrata and Phidippus, verses 198—280.

[1]) According to Legrand, *New Greek Comedy* (1917), p. 382, this play has only got a pause after verse 819. But it is by no means necessary to observe the pause. It is, I think, evident that there was an entr'acte between verses 171 and 172. However, those who wish to keep to Donatus's stage-directions ad verse 172 may ignore this pause, too. See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, p. 95.

[2]) In some late MSS. the division of acts given by Donatus has been added. Cf. Louis Havet, *Les entreactes dans Térence,* Rev. de Phil. 1916, p. 6.

[3]) See C. C. Conrad, *The Techn. of Continuous Action in Rom. Com.* p. 67.

[4]) Fleckeisen, Dziatzko, Thomas; Tyrrell and Kauer-Lindsay keep to the traditional division.

III. From Pamphilus's arrival till after Phidippus's discovery of Philumena's child, verses 281—576.
IV. From Sostrata's sacrificial offer to Bacchis's exit, verses 577—798.
V. Conclusion, verses 799—880.

Legrand, too, approves of this division and thinks it is in conformity with the original[1]). Rendered in the numbers of the Latin translation, the Ἑκυρά by Apollodorus consisted, according to Legrand, of 5 acts, of 140, 83, 296, 223 and 82 verses each.

If for the moment we put on one side a further treatment of the 1st act (we have said already that the monologue of the god of the original must have been removed by Terence there), and likewise the last act, for reasons explained above, we shall be especially struck, on considering the middle part of the comedy, by the slight length of II. In the translation this consists of only 83 verses, so that it is a hundred verses below the normal length. Now it might be supposed that Terence has expunged some scenes here. But to my mind this is out of the question. Excisions in II before, between or after the 3 scenes filling these 83 verses are inconceavable. For the entrance of Laches and Sostrata in 198 is logical, and really necessary after the exposition of I. It cannot be imagined that another opening scene should have preceded it. The subsequent entrance of Phidippus, in verse 243 (II, 2), and his conversation with the parents of his son-in-law is unexceptionable from a dramatic point of view. Between this and the preceding scene there cannot have been an interlude. There are, for the matter of that, no persons available for it. And it is exactly what one expects in a Greek comedy that after that scene and Sostrata's brief soliloquy (II 3, verse 273—280) ending with the prayer for Pamphilus's return, this very Pamphilus should enter the stage and that there is nothing else to precede his entrance. Consequently Terence cannot have made any cuts between 280 and 281.

[1]) *N. Gr. Com.*, pp. 375, 377 f. With regard to the last entr'acte L. has some doubt. He transposes Donatus *ad versum 825* to verse 830 and then concludes that Myrrina warned by Phidippus came out of the house in order to speak to Bacchis. He thinks, however, that it is probable that she took her into her house after that, so that an entr'acte before 799 would also be justified in the original. For the hypothetical scene between Myrrina and Bacchis vide infra, p. 27 ff.

From this it follows that verses 198—280 are not: an Apollodorus II strongly abridged by cuts, but simply the first 3 scenes of his second act. Accordingly Apollodorus had not got an entr'acte after verse 280. This is borne out by the facts already mentioned. An entre'acte between 280—281 is unacceptable for the very same reasons why an excision is inconceivable there. The dramatic effect would have been badly injured if the touching succession of prayer and fulfilment — and what fulfilment! — should have been interrupted by the singing and dancing of the Dionysic chorus. This gives us a right to hold that with Apollodorus Pamphilus entered the stage immediately after Sostrata's exit[1]). Nor is this and the fact that an act of 83 verses is not a full act the only reason to think that an entr'acte after verse 280 is unacceptable. There is a third reason, which is equally sound. Pamphilus's arrival, with its immediate result — his discovery that Philumena is going to be the mother of a child that he cannot consider to be his — as an element of the whole of the dramatic events does not belong to the 3rd, but to the 2nd act. For with Menander (and why should it have been different with his disciple, Apollodorus?) it is the rule that the situation is consolidated in the 2nd act, from which the complication is to follow in the 3rd, which in its turn will be solved in the 4th by an *anagnorisis*. This is perfectly clear from the six comedies by Menander, which I have reconstructed and appears with objective certainty from the *Heauton Timoroumenos,* where there can be no doubt whatever regarding the end of II, because it has been separated from the beginning of III by a clear interval: a whole night.

In what way does the situation leading to a complication arise in the *Hecyra?* It arises because Pamphilus returns and for a reason only known to his wife and his mother-in-law, finds himself so placed that it is necessary for him to dissolve his marriage. And this is at the same time the proper theme of the play: a youthful husband returns to find his wife in child-bed and thinks he has sound reasons to deny paternity. It is impossible that this theme should not have been expounded before the 3rd act. And following the course of the story we shall not only be able to determine the place of the

[1]) For the total change of characters within the act see *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, p. 127[3].

second entr'acte, but also of the third. We see how Pamphilus is attacked by Laches, by Phidippus, and by Sostrata, after he has made up his mind to divorce Philumena. We learn how all the objections he raises because he wishes to keep his real reason a secret from them appear one after the other to be untenable, just as all his pretexts do and all their suspicions, so that in the end he does not know what to say. And finally we see that the very last measure, by means of which those well-meaning but uninformed relatives wish to compel him, brings an unexpected solution due to the recognition. If one keeps to the maxim that the recognition belongs to the 4th act [1]), it is evident that the complications which led to the recognition must have formed the material of the 3rd act, just as the situation on which those complications were based arose in the 2nd act. Anyone who divides the action of the *Hecyra* in accordance with the phases mentioned above, must place the end of II before verse 451, and the end of III at verse 798; so that, starting from this scheme of structure, Terence has only retained from his model 3 full acts minus an exposition of the god. As regards the 4th and the 5th act, they are represented in the Latin play by some 80 verses (799—880), whose authenticity is naturally highly dubious, as they had to comprise in a small compass the *anagnorisis* together with the ultimate development.

The disposition of the acts in the Greek *Hekyra* as we have given above differs in five respects from the division applied to the Latin version either by the *codices* or by the editors. We assume (as has been proved above) that the action does not allow of an interlude at verse 280, we deny that the action requires an interlude at verse 515 or verse 576, and we hold that it is possible if not necessary, to insert an entr'acte before verse 451, while we refute an entr'acte after verse 726. These points shall be discussed one by one.

The interlude after 515 given by the MSS. is, far from being indispensable, highly undesirable from the point of view of dramatic construction. After 509 Phidippus enters his house, where he immediately discovers that he has got a grandson; at 516 Myrrina appears at the door highly dismayed. The intervening 6 verses exactly

[1]) See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg*, pp. 42, 86, 89, 92—93, 105, 108, 115, 136, 137, 140, 143, 168, 194, 197, 200, 233, 234.

fill up the time necessary for an action and a reaction, viz. the time for Phidippus's action (he enters, hears a baby cry, runs to his daughter's room [1]) and the time for Myrrina's reaction, which is its immediate result. The entr'acte after 576 inserted by the editors has nothing to recommend it, except the total change of the *dramatis personae*. But it is a well-known fact that in Greek drama such a change may take place, and actually does take place repeatedly, within the limits of one act [2]. And as the scene beginning at 577 has exactly the same purpose as the one which ends at 576 — for in either the reconciliation of the young married couple is advocated — there is no reason to incorporate those two scenes with two different acts.

If one accepts the view that what is similar should be united to one act, one will also have to separate what is dissimilar by means of an entr'acte. For this reason a line should be drawn between verse 448 and verse 451, the dividing line marking the end of Apollodorus's 2nd act and the beginning of the 3rd act. All that lies between 198 and 448 is, as a part of the action, calculated to create and complete the situation, in which the parties will meet next and encounter each other. Laches, Sostrata, and Phidippus explain matters to each other (198—242, 243—280), Pamphilus returns from his journey and discovers the startling fact which is the source of misunderstanding in this play, he has discussed the matter with Myrrina and promised her to be silent, he meets and greets his mother and requests her to enter the house, and he removes the undesirable Parmeno (281—335, 336—414, 415—448). All this is a preparation to the struggle, which is to begin in 451, when Laches and Phidippus return from their visit to the market [3]. Similarly the preparation ended in Menander's *Andria* when in verse 531 Simo started to look for Chremes. Similarly it ended in his *Eunouchos* with the departure of Chremes to the house

[1]) Cf. verses 516—18.

M y r r. Perii, quid agam? quo me vortam? quid viro meo respondebo
Misera? nam audivisse vocem pueri visust vagientis:
Ita corripuit derepente tacitus sese ad filiam.

[2]) See p. 13 note 1.

[3]) Cf. verse 273.

of the *"Hospes"* [1]), in the *Heauton Timoroumenos* with Antiphila and Bacchis entering Chremes's dwelling [2]).

It is clear that Terence has bridged over an entr'acte of the original by inserting a few verses, as he frequently did in his adaptations [3]). Apparently he thought it rather suitable to keep Pamphilus on the stage, because presently he will have to speak to the two *senes,* and so he inserts these words of his:

attat eccum Phidippum et patrem
Video: horsum pergunt. quid dicam hisce, incertus sum [4]).

That at this point an old entr'acte has been bridged over is borne out by some details of the Latin text. In 358 Pamphilus had said to his mother: "I sodes intro, c o n s e q u a r i a m t e, mea mater"; as a result of that bridging over he does not enter the house before 495 [5]), and when he enters it is from sheer necessity, whereas it would have been his filial duty towards a mother he values so highly to enter as soon as his vicissitudes would make this possible for him. It is the very entr'acte which could give him that opportunity. Consequently one has to assume that with Apollodorus he carried out his intention of 358 after 448, and that after the interlude, when he had listened to his mother's complaints, he came out again at the same time when the two fathers entered the stage (451). We have only to invert the order of the greetings between father and son in this scene: *"Salve, mi pater"* and *"Gnate mi, salve"*, to restore the original state. And I think that this inversion together with the expunction of 449—450 makes the situation, which is somewhat strange in Terence's play, perfectly clear. An unprejudiced reader of verses 451 ff. will certainly feel that Pamphilus, engrossed in thoughts which he murmurs to himself (452—

[1]) *Eun.* 538.

[2]) *H. T.* 409.

[3]) For instance *Andria* 226 f., 532; *H.T.* 561; *Eun.* 724 ff., 917 ff. Regarding this and the divisions mentioned above see: *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, pp. 102, 105, 88, 46, 48; 105—7, 41—42, 85. Similarly in the *Phormio,* see pp. 61—62.

[4]) Verses 449—50.

[5]) That he had entered the house is not evident from Terence's text before verse 577, where he leaves it.

54), does not notice what happens around him, while Laches on hearing his voice first asks: "Quem ego hic audivi loqui?" (453), and then goes up to his son saying: "Ipsus est de quo hoc agebam tecum" (455). Is not it utterly absurd in Terence's text that Pamphilus after his shock of 449 and the words: "attat eccum Phidippum et patrem video: horsum pergunt. quid dicam hisce incertus sum", suddenly turns blind and deaf and loses himself in the deep pit of his troubled thoughts, only to spring out of it like a Jack-in-the-box, in order to forestall his father with the words: *"Salve, mi pater"*, before the latter has been able to greet him? I think that all the elements of a new act are here, leaving on one side Pamphilus's prodit. The young man leaves home thinking aloud about his predicament, the two old gentlemen coming from the market enter the stage and conclude their conversation, Laches hears somebody talk, looks around, discovers his son and by means of a loud greeting rouses him from his reverie. The reader may judge for himself from the text copied here, in which I have inverted the order of the greetings.

Lach. Dixtin dudum illam dixisse, se expectare filium?
Phid. Factum. Lach. Venisse aiunt: redeat. Pam. Quam causam dicam patri,
Quam obrem non redducam, nescio [1]. Lach. Quem ego hic audivi loqui?
Pam. Certum offirmare est viam me quam decrevi persequi.
Lach. Ipsus est de quo hoc agebam tecum. Gnate mi, salve.
Pam. Salve, mi pater [2].

If it follows from the foregoing that the 3rd act of Apollodorus's *Hekyra* commenced at the scene of verse 451, it is practically certain on numerical grounds that the end of that act was not at 515, where the 3rd act ends in the *Terentius-codices,* any more than at 576, where the editors have inserted the entr'acte. Our structural objections against these divisions, as explained above, are thus corroborated. Accordingly the 3rd act must have comprised all that occurs between 451 and 798 in Terence's play. For the end of an

[1]) Pamphilus had learned from his mother, in the house, that Laches was in town but had gone to the market.
[2]) Verses 451—456.

act is not possible at 606, nor at 622, nor at 726, nor at 767, four places where a scene is finished. This is also admitted by the editors mentioned: contrary to the *codices* they remove the end of the act (their 4th act) from 726 to 798. That they are right is shown by the Terentius text. The connection of this series of scenes remains intact, and this also refers to 727. Without having left the stage Laches is waiting for Bacchis's arrival [1]). The relation between these two scenes is hardly less firm than the connection between 606 and 607 or between 622 and 623. If we conceived the action of the original to be arranged in such a way that at 726 Laches left the stage to re-enter it at 729 and that after an entr'acte, we should arbitrarily sever what belongs together.

What is shown here by the state of Terence's adaptation is further borne out by the contents of the dialogue. For Laches's negotiations with Bacchis, in which Phidippus, too, joins after a lapse of time, are nothing but the last of a series of moves with which the two fathers try to checkmate their opposite numbers in this play of marriage or divorce. Considered from this point of view everything between 451 and 798 belongs to an organic whole, because it has one and the same tendency. Moreover, and this is not less important, the whole of it is "3rd act" in accordance with the character of its contents, because it works towards the complication and leads it up to a climax. The whole of these scenes comprises Laches's argument against Pamphilus (451—515), Phidippus's sermon against

[1]) The poet conceived Bacchis's house to be quite near (see verses 98, 720), probably in the street to the left of the stage. This is evident from the fact that in I 1 Philotis and Syra coming from Bacchis (60, 98) and on their way to the centre of the town (195) cross the stage. The situation of Dorio's house in the *Epidikazomenos* and of Philoxenus's in the *Dis Exapaton* was the same. For a better understanding of what I am going to say later about the scene between Laches and Bacchis I wish to point out here that Laches lives on the right of the stage from the spectator's point of view, and Phidippus on the left. This appears from I 1 and 2. For Philotis and Syra have already spoken 18 verses on their way to town when they are nearing Laches's house. (See verses 58—75 and 81). It is corroborated by II 2. Phidippus on his way to the market (Cf. verse 273) and consequently going to the right along the stage, meets Laches and Sostrata, who are standing before their door. (Cf. verse 246). It follows that Phidippus lived on the left. For the indications of direction generally see: Haigh—Pickard-Cambridge, *The Attic Theatre,* Ch. IV, § 3.

Myrrina (516—576), Sostrata's offer to leave the house for the sake of her daughter-in-law (577—606, 607—622), the dialogue between Pamphilus and the two fathers, where the child discovered by Phidippus comes in for discussion; therefore, after the retreat of the son, the old gentlemen resolve to speak to Bacchis so as to deprive Myrrina of the reason for further opposition (623 ff.). All this, together with Bacchis's explanation itself (727 ff.), does not mean anything but this: to break Pamphilus's and Myrrina's incomprehensible recalcitrance. Accordingly, when at verse 798 Bacchis has entered to repeat solemnly to Philumena and Myrrina her declaration that there has not been anything between herself and Pamphilus since his marriage, the climax of the complication, and consequently the end of the 3rd act, has been reached.

I have mentioned those changes brought about by Terence, which bear on the line of argument I am following. His further changes in this part will come in for discussion of their own accord in the treatment of the final scenes of his adaptation (V, 3 and 4). But there is one point which I think it desirable to discuss at once, viz. a rather far-reaching change in the verses 727—798, scenes 1 and 2 of V in accordance with the numbering of the *codices*. When the 2nd of these scenes commences, in verse 767, Phidippus appears on the stage with a *Nutrix* whom he had gone to fetch in verse 726. If I am not mistaken Terence has fixed Phidippus's exit and return at a somewhat earlier time than the original, apparently because he did not wish to withhold the *Nutrix* and her comical appearance from his audience, which appearance had to be erased in the next act as a result of his changes. But whatever reasons there may have been for this earlier appearance of a figure which has no part in the action, it is, I think, an incontestable fact that in these scenes Terence deviates from the original course of events. This appears from the strange, inconsistent behaviour of Laches and Phidippus both before and in 725—26, a circumstance which has been pointed out repeatedly [1].

[1]) See for example Kunst, *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Kom.*, p. 94[2]. Donatus's note on 725 is an apology rather than an explanation.

According to Schadewaldt (Hermes 1931, p. 8[1]) Apollodorus is responsible for the distorted action. Schadewaldt thinks that Apollodorus did not

In 715 Laches asks Phidippus what he should do, now that a suspicion has arisen that Pamphilus's relation with Bacchis still continues:

Quid ergo agam, Phidippe? Quid das consili? [1])

Phidippus answers:

Quid agas? Meretricem hanc primum adeundam censeo.
O r e m u s: a c c u s e m u s: gravius denique
M i n i t e m u r, si cum illo habuerit rem postea [2]).

Consequently by using the plural form of the verb he alludes as often as three times to his help in these negotiations. Further Laches requests him to offer his help, after he has sent for Bacchis:

At te oro porro in hac re adiutor sis mihi [3]).

Phidippus appears to be quite willing:

Ah,
Iam dudum dixi idemque nunc dico, Laches:
Manere adfinitatem hanc inter nos volo,
Si ullo modo est ut possit: quod spero fore [4]).

Then suddenly:

Sed vin adesse me una, dum istam convenis? [5])

And Laches really replies:

Immo abi vero, aliquam puero nutricem para [6]).

It is strange that, contrary to the measure decided upon in 725—26, Phidippus takes part in the interrogation, due to the fact that he

wish to bring the three characters, Laches, Phidippus and Bacchis together, because they were not suitable for a triangle-scene, and that he therefore removed Phidippus. This surmise does not do away with the objections, I think. The behaviour of Laches and of Phidippus before and in 726 remains equally inconsistant. Moreover, Comedy does not in the least preclude an inactive onlooker at some distance, and further, under the circumstances, the three characters are together on the stage all the same, during the verses 767—798, and w i t h the *Nutrix* as an inactive figure.

[1]) Verse 715.
[2]) Verses 716—18.
[3]) Verse 721.
[4]) Verses 721—24.
[5]) Verse 725.
[6]) Verse 726.

returns [1]) before Bacchis has entered. It is objectionable that, without knowing Phidippus's opinion about the matter, Laches wishes to send Bacchis to Myrrina entirely on his own authority [2]). It is even more strange that after this the girl remains on the stage during 30 verses, although she has declared herself to be willing to go and in fact is preparing to go — for Laches gives her a severe warning against duplicity [3]). Besides, the late intervention of Phidippus causes repetitions, which make these scenes uncommonly slow even for the *Hecyra*. The old unity of the scene may be easily restored, if those repetitions [4]) are cancelled, a group of verses is transposed and if it is imagined that, while Laches goes to meet Bacchis and begins the conversation with her, Phidippus remains in the background on the other side of the stage. And that the situation as sketched here is not based on fancy, but on reality, appears from the placing of the actors at the beginning of the scene and from the word "*adgrediar*" with which Laches goes up to the approaching Bacchis [5]).

Here follows the result of our reconstruction.

727 Bacchis. Laches. Phidippus

Bac. Non hoc de nilost, quod Laches me nunc conventam esse expetit:
728 Nec pol me multum fallit, quin quod suspicor sit quod velit.
Lach. Videndumst ne minus propter iram hinc inpetrem quam possiem,
730 Aut nequid faciam plus, quod post me minus fecisse satius sit.
Adgrediar. Bacchis, salve.

[1]) At verse 767.

[2]) Verses 753—55.

[3]) Verses 761—67.

[4]) On the ground of the repetitions A. Schmitt, *De Pseudoli Plaut. exemplo Att.* 67 ff., considers the whole of scene V 2 as an original contribution by Terence. We leave this opinion and the conclusions drawn from it for what it is worth.

[5]) Verse 731. As is evident from verse 719 the two *senes* are standing before Laches's house, that is to the right of the stage, while Bacchis is approaching from the left. (Cf. p. 18 note 1).

B a c. Salve, Laches. L a c h. Credo edepol te non nil mirari, Bacchis,
Quid sit quapropter te huc foras puerum evocare iussi.
B a c. Ego pol quoque etiam timida sum, quom venit in mentem quae sim,
Ne nomen mi obstet quaestuis: nam mores facile tutor.
L a c h. Si vera dicis, nil tibi est a me pericli, mulier:
Nam iam aetate ea sum, ut non siet peccato mi ignosci aequom:
Quo magis omnis res cautius ne temere faciam adcuro.
Nam si facis facturave es, bonas quod par est facere:
Inscitum offerre iniuriam tibi inmerenti iniquomst.
B a c. Est magna ecastor gratia de istac re quam tibi habeam:
Nam qui post factam iniuriam se expurget, parum mi prosit.
Sed quid istuc est? L a c h. Meum receptas filium ad te Pamphilum. B a c. Ah.
L a c h. Sine dicam: uxorem hanc prius quam duxit, vostrum amorem pertuli.
Mane: non dum etiam dixi id quod volui. Hic nunc habet uxorem:
Quaere alium tibi firmiorem, dum tibi tempus consulendi est:
Nam neque ille hoc animo erit aetatem, neque pol tu eadem ista aetate.
B a c. Quis id aït? L a c h. Socrus. B a c. Mene? L a c h. Te ipsam: et filiam abduxit suam,
Puerumque ob eam rem clam voluit, natus qui est, extinguere [1].
B a c. Si aliud scirem, qui firmare meam apud vos possem fidem,
751 Sanctius quam ius iurandum, id pollicerer tibi, Laches,
Segregatum habuisse, uxorem ut duxit, a me Pamphilum.

771 *Laches beckons Phidippus to join them.*

L a c h. Phidippe, Bacchis deierat persancte... [P h i d. Haecine east? L a c h. Haec est.]
P h i d. Nec pol istae metuont deos neque eas respicere deos opinor.

[1]) This is carelessness on the part of Apollodorus; for Laches had not learnt the latter circumstance, but Bacchis had to know this for the *anagnorisis*.

B a c. Ancillas dedo: quolubet cruciatu per me exquire.
Haec res hic agitur: Pamphilo me facere ut redeat uxor
Oportet: quod si perficio, non paenitet me famae,
Solam fecisse id quod aliae meretrices facere fugitant.
Laches talks to Phidippus privately.
L a c h. Phidippe, nostras mulieres suspectas fuisse falso
Nobis in re ipsa invenimus: porro hanc nunc experiamur.
Nam si compererit crimini tua se uxor credidisse,
Missam iram faciet: sin autem est ob eam rem iratus gnatus,
Quod peperit uxor clam, id levest: cito ab eo haec ira abscedet.
Profecto in hac re nil malist, quod sit discidio dignum.
P h i d. Velim quidem hercle. L a c h. Exquire: adest: quod satis sit, faciet ipsa.
P h i d. Quid mi istaec narras? An quia non tute dudum audisti,
De hac re animus meus ut sit, Laches? illis modo explete animum.
754 *Laches goes up to Bacchis.*
[753 L a c h. Lepida es. sed scin, quid volo potius sodes facias? B a c. Quid? cedo.]
L a c h. Eas ad mulieres huc intro atque istuc ius iurandum idem
Polliceare illis. Exple animum eis teque hoc crimine expedi.
B a c. Faciam. quod pol, si esset alia ex hoc quaestu, haud faceret, scio,
Ut de tali causa nuptae mulieri se ostenderet.
Sed nolo esse falsa fama gnatum suspectum tuom,
Nec leviorem vobis, quibus est minime aequom, eum viderier
Inmerito: nam meritus de me est, quod queam illi ut commodem.
L a c h. Facilem benivolumque lingua tua iam tibi me reddidit:
Nam non sunt solae arbitratae haec: ego quoque etiam credidi.
Nunc quam ego te esse praeter nostram opinionem comperi,
Fac eadem ut sis porro: nostra utere amicitia ut voles:
Aliter si facias — me reprimam, ne aegre quicquam ex me audias.

Verum hoc te moneo unum, amicus qualis sim aut quid possiem
Potius quam inimicus, periclum facias.
[786 L a c h. Quaeso edepol, Bacchis, quod mihi es pollicita tute ut serves.
B a c. Ob eam rem vin ergo intro eam? L a c h. I, exple animum eis, coge ut credant.]
788 B a c. Eo, etsi scio pol eis fore meum conspectum invisum hodie:
Nam nupta meretrici hostis est, a viro ubi segregatast.
L a c h. At haec amicae erunt, ubi quam obrem adveneris resciscent:
[P h i d. At easdem amicas fore tibi promitto, rem ubi cognorint:] [1]
Nam illas errore et te simul suspitione exsolves.
B a c. Perii, pudet Philumenae [2] [:me sequimini intro huc ambae] [3].
L a c h. Quid est quod mihi malim quam quod huic intellego evenire,
Ut gratiam ineat sine suo dispendio et mihi prosit?
Nam si est ut haec nunc Pamphilum vere ab se segregarit,
Scit sibi nobilitatem ex eo et rem natam et gloriam esse:
Referet gratum ei unaque nos sibi opera amicos iunget [4].

With these verses Terence ends his scene. But he omits to mention the exit of the two *senes*. Apparently he made them disappear in silence into their respective homes [5]. He no longer needed them,

[1]) 791 om. A: eras. E.
[2]) After these words Bacchis enters the house.
[3]) See p. 37.
[4]) Consequently Terence has transposed 15 verses, which occurred between verse 752 and verse 754, and has inserted them as verses 771—785 between verses 767a and 788, which followed each other in the original. Verses 753, 767b—770, 771b, 786—87, (791), and 793b are his own work; most of these were meant as stop-gaps.
[5]) It goes without saying that Phidippus's presence there, at that moment, is most undesirable. But we know from verses 870—71 that Terence's Myrrina knew how to cope with the situation. She kept him out of the room (although she did not know why Bacchis had come) and then made an untrue statement.

so that it was not necessary for him to trouble about making their re-entrance plausible in anticipation. But we may assume that in the old play Phidippus left the stage at this point in order to fetch a *Nutrix,* and Laches in order to look for the fugitive Pamphilus [1]), and that both of them have intimated their intention.

When we put the 3 acts of the Greek *Hekyra,* after the manner in which they have been unwrapped from Terence's text, side by side with the scheme of Menander's plays, we shall expect two more acts of which the former, i.e. the fourth of Apollodorus's comedy, brings the *anagnorisis* together with the dénouement, the latter, i.e. the final act, the ultimate development. And what is given by the two scenes, eighty lines in all, which come after verse 798 in Terence's play? They give a dénouement, but they do not give the ultimate development. For the whole final development, i.e. the whole 5th act, which we have to assume in Apollodorus's work on the ground of compositional tradition, is represented in the Latin play by 8 lines of dialogue between Pamphilus and Bacchis, of which the quintessence is to be found in these words:

Pam. Dic mi, harum rerum numquid dixti meo patri? Bac. Nil.
Pam. Neque opus est
Adeo muttito. placet non fieri hoc itidem ut in comoediis,
Omnia omnes ubi resciscunt. [2])

"That Pamphilus has been the victim of a glaring misunderstanding does not concern any one but those who know." How much of this was to be found in Apollodorus's work we shall not be able to determine — as I have said above — before we have decided what

[1]) Pamphilus had fled at 705, and unlike his flight at 495 he had no doubt not fled into the house, but farther away, for there had to be a climax in his flight. Perhaps he went in the direction of Bacchis's house, so that the fathers thought that he went there to seek consolation. After verse 798 Laches expects that Bacchis will certainly convince Philumena and Myrrina by her statement. After that they will have to speak to Pamphilus again, as is denoted in verses 780—782.

[2]) 865—67. Bacchis has not had an opportunity to tell Laches anything, but Pamphilus cannot know this. Although Terence is responsible for these verses it cannot be said that they are perfectly absurd.

his 4th act looked like. So our first task is to analyse Terence's dénouement, which is given in verses 799—864.

It might almost be said that it is obvious, so that no proof need be given, that this dénouement is not in conformity with that of the original. For in an Attic comedy, in the theatre of Athens, it is all but unthinkable that the discovery, the *anagnorisis,* with which the dénouement coalesces, should have been introduced on the stage ready-made from the entr'acte between III and IV, as Terence does, and should just have been communicated to him whom it concerned most — nay, not even communicated, but only confirmed by Bacchis's beaming face, for Pamphilus already knows everything from the slave sent to fetch him [1].

However, an assertion based on analogy or deduction is not generally accepted. Fortunately we have a better proof. For Donatus provides us with direct evidence, from which it appears that Terence has changed the *anagnorisis,* or rather expunged it.

At the point where the editors begin his 5th act, i.e. at verse 799, the situation is thus. Parmeno, Pamphilus's slave, enters after he has looked for the fictitious Callidemides of Myconus, since his departure in 443 [2]. As far as the economy of action goes his only function here is to fetch Pamphilus. Accordingly he immediately sees Bacchis, when the latter is leaving Phidippus's house [3]. She beckons to the slave, and tells him to run to Pamphilus. As he rushes away, his errand runs thus: "Bacchis asks Pamphilus to go to Philumena; the ring which he had given Bacchis on a certain occasion has been recognized by Myrrina as her daughter's property" [4]. It is clear, I think, that by this last addition to Parmeno's errand [5] which indeed is the disclosure of the secret, Terence has purposely made an *anagnorisis* in set form superfluous.

After Parmeno has left, Bacchis bursts out in a song of joy — "*monodia*" it is called by Donatus in his note to 816: "Reliqua pars argumenti per monodiam narratur". She is jubilant in anticipation

[1]) Verses 811—12, 845—46.
[2]) See verse 432.
[3]) Verses 806 f.
[4]) Verses 809, 811—12.
[5]) Cf. 811 f. Parm. Nil aliud dicam? Bac. Etiam: cognosse anulum illum Myrrinam etc.

of the joy which she has caused Pamphilus by her coming. "The ring she wears (hic... anulus, 821) caused the discovery". Then she recalls an evening "about ten months ago" [1], when Pamphilus "anhelans, sine comite, vini plenus" had suddenly dropped in on her with that ring, and she had immediately asked him anxiously: "Mi Pamphile, amabo, quid exanimatu's obsecro? aut unde anulum istum nactu's?" [2]. It is with these words that Donatus writes: "brevitati consulit Terentius, nam in Graeca haec aguntur, non narrantur" [3].

This note is really puzzling. It is beyond doubt that Donatus does not mean: "in the original Bacchis has drawn out Pamphilus by means of these questions". These words can only have been spoken as real questions in Bacchis's house, along with the event and not three quarters of a year later on the stage. So Donatus's note cannot but mean: "In Apollodorus's work this was said in a dialogue, not in a monologue". Therefore the question has been raised: Who was, in the Greek play, Bacchis's partner in that dialogue? Nencini has been the first to suggest that Myrrina was that partner [4], which suggestion has been a successful one. Leo [5], Legrand [6], and Kunst [7] also accepted this view [8], Legrand further follows Nencini in wishing to place that conversation between Bacchis and Myrrina immediately after verse 793. So they think that Myrrina came outside before the entr'acte in order to hear Bacchis's declaration about her breach with Pamphilus. On the other hand Leo and Kunst are of opinion that this dialogue was spoken at the very same point of the action where in Terence's work it says Bacchis's "*narratio*", so that in the Greek play Myrrina accompanied Bacchis on the stage after the entr'acte.

It need not be said that it is most improbable that at verse 793

[1] Verse 822: abhinc mensis decem fere.
[2] Verses 824—25.
[3] Ad versum 825.
[4] F. Nencini, *De Terentio eiusque fontibus*, p. 61.
[5] *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 216 A, *Röm. Lit. Gesch.*, p. 241, 2.
[6] *N. Gr. Com.*, pp. 377—78.
[7] *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Kom.*, pp. 96 ff.
[8] Lafaye, *Le modèle de l'Hécyre*, Revue de Philol. 1916, p. 31, makes Sostrata take part in this hypothetical scene.

Myrrina voluntarily came to hear Bacchis's solemn declaration. She would thereby have acted contrary to her own wishes and her obligation towards Pamphilus. For she does not really believe that his liaison still exists, but only simulates she is sure of it. In view of this, how can she have wished to co-operate in any way to be convinced of the contrary? [1] Another objection against Nencini's supposition is mentioned by Jachmann [2]: it was asserted by Nencini that Terence deviated from his model at 793, and Donatus makes his note at 825. A third objection results from our above reconstruction of Apollodorus's division into acts. If Nencini's opinion were right, the Greek *Hekyra* gave its *anagnorisis* too early, in the 3rd act instead of in the 4th. Nobody will expect such infringement of the composition that was adhered to by Menander from his contemporary and disciple, unless it was unavoidable. But even the view that Myrrina accompanied Bacchis on the stage after the entr'acte and spoke to her, is met by all kinds of difficulties. In the first place we should like to know how it is that Terence, if he renders a conversation of the two women in Bacchis's *narratio,* has inverted the natural course of the dialogue. For this interview should have begun with Myrrina's inquiry after the origin of Bacchis's ring — an inquiry which is mentioned by Terence in 830—31 —, and as a reply Bacchis should have said what is to be read in 822—29. I don't think a valid reason can be alleged why this order had to be changed [3]. A second objection is of greater importance. It is simply impossible for Myrrina to enter in the situation which is developing in the verses 799—810, and which in fact could not but develop there. Parmeno returns from the Acropolis, as is only natural. He has been waiting there for hours, in vain. Bacchis leaves Myrrina's house (806), which is the obvious thing to do. For she has entered

[1]) Legrand tries to meet this objection by the words: "possibly intending to forbid her entering the house". This is indeed a most practical way to get rid of an undesired visitor! We have this done by a servant.

[2]) *R.E.* Va 639 f.

[3]) The same difficulty applies of course to an interview between B. and M. at the point suggested by Nencini. He wishes therefore to transpose Donatus's note to verse 830, and thus he shows its weakness himself. But the difference between the hypothetical scene and Bacchis's narration would of needs be so great that slight deviations in the order might be left unexplained.

before the entr'acte to leave it after the entr'acte. And Parmeno does not have an independent function in this comedy. He is nothing but the patented messenger. So the meeting of Bacchis and Parmeno means that Pamphilus has to be fetched. For another man's servant can only be employed for the benefit of that man, i.e. that servant's master. The instruction derives its authority from the master. But the very fact that Pamphilus is summoned proves that Myrrina did not leave the house with Bacchis. For if Myrrina also came, the "recognition" between her and Bacchis would either have to begin or to be continued. In the former case Bacchis would not yet have anything to communicate to Pamphilus, in the latter case she would not risk sending for him, because his presence during her interview with Myrrina might be very undesirable. A dialogue between Myrrina and Bacchis would therefore only be thinkable before Parmeno's appearance, before verse 799, not after his entrance and exit, after verse 815. But for many reasons this conception is absolutely objectionable. It cannot be correct that a scene Bacchis-Myrrina has been expunged between 798 and 799 and has been rendered in verses 822 ff. In the first place this appears from Terence's text in 799—810. For that text does not show a trace of a hitch, neither in the verses, where Parmeno is entering first (799) and Bacchis next (806), nor in their subsequent meeting. These passages fit in perfectly in what might be expected here in the Greek play. Terence does not alter his model before 810, where he has arbitrarily inserted verses 811—12. He does not choose a form and a method of his own throughout before verse 816, as Donatus communicates with the words: "Reliqua pars argumenti per monodiam narratur". In the second place it appears from the fact that the *"narratio"*, which is taken as the contents of this hypothetical scene, does not commence before verse 822, so that Donatus does not make mention of a dialogue lost through change of form before verse 825. It may certainly be considered impossible that he does not speak of a dialogue before verse 825, which had been expunged before 799. We must therefore conclude that there has not been a dialogue of Myrrina and Bacchis in Apollodorus's *Hekyra* either there or in any other place. And besides, is not this idea contrary to any reasonable sense to be attached to Donatus's note? That note refers

to the words: "mi Pamphile, amabo, quid exanimatu's obsecro? aut unde anulum istum nactu's? dic mi." The note itself runs: "In Graeca haec aguntur, non narrantur". How can this ever mean: "in the Greek play Bacchis says this to Myrrina", her words being clearly directed to Pamphilus? Moreover it should be borne in mind that this scene, transposed to the Greek *Hekyra,* leads us no farther than the beginning of the 4th act, which must have consisted of 150 verses at least. At verse 825, that is to say 25 verses after the beginning of the act and 55 verses before the end of the Latin play, Donatus writes: "brevitati consulit Terentius". He seems to refer to the abridgment of the scene discussed just now. But the figures I have mentioned give proof positive that this *"brevitas"* has brought about a further and far more extensive abridgment. I will now try to determine what has been expunged by Terence, both here and further on.

The natural interpretation of the words: "in Graeca haec aguntur" runs, as I have said: "in the Greek model Bacchis says this to Pamphilus" [1]. This tallies perfectly with the course of the action. Bacchis meets Parmeno and tells him to fetch Pamphilus. It follows that she and he have something to say to each other, something, that is, of greater importance than the kind compliments which are the only confidential things Terence let them say to each other [2]. Apollodorus's scene, replaced by Terence's *narratio,* must have been a real *anagnorisis* in some way or other. The tradition of the Attic stage guarantees that.

The question therefore is: on what basis had this scene of recognition between Bacchis and Pamphilus been built up? *"Anagnorisis"* cannot mean: „a report of facts discovered behind the scenes to outside the stage". Therefore it goes without saying that, in order to find back the original state, we have to begin expunging from Terence's play the second part of Parmeno's message, his question and Bacchis's answer:

[1]) The same interpretation is given by K. Stavenhagen, Hermes XLV, 1910, p. 581, but he does not enter into the matter any further.

[2]) Verses 855—64.

— Nil aliud dicam? — Etiam: cognosse anulum illum Myrrinam
Gnatae suae fuisse, quem ipsus olim dederat mihi [1].

Apart from this it is evident that, when at the beginning of IV Bacchis entered the stage, she only surmised the identity of Pamphilus and Philumena's assailant, but by no means knew this as an incontestable fact. Consequently she sent for Pamphilus in order to verify her surmise. What means to that end she got? She did not know exactly the place, hour and time of Pamphilus's nocturnal meeting. The hour is called *"nocte prima"*, the time *"abhinc mensis decem fere"* [2], while a definite place is not mentioned. And Pamphilus did certainly not know all this better than Bacchis. On that evening he was *"vini plenus"* [3]. He was also *"sine comite"* [4], so that the sober witness, on whom she could rely, was lacking in her examination. So the only effectual means of verification was a *corpus delicti*. We know that *corpus delicti* from Terence's play: the ring, which, according to Myrrina's complaint, the assailant had taken from her daughter [5] and which Bacchis had discovered in Pamphilus's hand on the evening in question [6]. But why did, in Apollodorus's play, that ring become a means of recognition on the stage, so as to verify a suspicion that had occurred to Bacchis, whereas in Terence's play it gives indubitable certainty at once, and behind the scenes? Why is, in order to discover the truth, the presence of Pamphilus superfluous in the Latin play, whereas he had to be present in the Greek play? I think that there is only one reply to this questions: because according to the Greek version, Philumena's ring had remained in the possession of Pamphilus, whereas in Terence's version it is on Bacchis's finger (where it remains even after it has been recognized by the legal owner!). Therefore

[1]) Verses 811—12.
Command, question and reply in 809 (B a c. Dic me orare ut veniat. P a r. Ad te? B a c. Immo ad Philumenam.) are in my opinion authentic. But for addition of Philumena's name Bacchis's request would be compromising for both herself and Pamphilus.

[2]) Verse 822.

[3]) Verse 823.

[4]) Verse 823. Cf. *Epitrep.* verses 254—56.

[5]) Verse 574: Ipse eripuit vi, in digito quem habuit, virgini abiens anulum.

[6]) Verse 825.

van Leeuwen's indignation at the "purse-cutter", who makes a present of the stolen ornament straight from the hand of the person robbed to his best girl [1]), attaches to Terence only, but not to his model. And is it not curious that the donation of that ring to Bacchis is not mentioned in the account of events, but only in verses made by the adaptator? For the addition to Parmeno's errand in verses 811—12 — "cognosse anulum illum Myrrinam gnatae suae fuisse, quem ipsus olim dederat mihi" — is Terence's and likewise Pamphilus's repetition of that communication, in the question he asks Parmeno (845): "Sic te opinor dixisse, invenisse Myrrinam Bacchidem anulum suom habere..., eum quem olim ei dedi". This, and the imperturbability with which Bacchis keeps the ring discovered on her finger, which she should immediately have yielded (and might safely have yielded, for it is no longer of any interest to the action [2]), can be considered as additional indications that Terence has changed the original *donnée*.

Nevertheless it need not be doubtful that the Greek Bacchis wore a ring, that the ring provided a trace of Philumena's unknown assailant, and that this ring drew Myrrina's attention. An involuntary reaction of Myrrina's when seeing Bacchis's ring—this only could make Bacchis suspect Pamphilus's paternity. For it is impossible that Myrrina should have Bacchis guess the secret of Philumena's violation, a secret which even Phidippus was not allowed to know. The question known from Terence's play: "Where did you get that ring from" [3]), had accordingly also been put to Bacchis by Apollodorus's Myrrina. What led her to that question? She thought for a moment that Bacchis's ring was Philumena's [4]) but she was wrong. Consequently there must have been a cause of that opinion

[1]) Menandri *Fabularum Reliquiae* 3, p. 15: Terentii vero Pamphilus, qui virginem in tenebris non vitiavit tantum, sed et spoliavit anulo, dein turpissimi facinoris illud monumentum dono dedit amiculae, sectoris potius zonarii egit partes quam iuvenis haud improbi, qui multo vino stimulatus humani quid in se admisisset. Quocum in gratiam redire Philumena quomodo tandem potuit, postquam intellexit anulum a suo digito etiam tepidum meretrici donatum esse induendum! Procul talia distant ab arte et ingenio Menandri.

[2]) Bacchis does not do anything with it except show it to the audience.

[3]) Verse 831.

[4]) With the alternative mentioned on p. 38.

as well as of that error, and Myrrina must have explained both the reason for her question and the cause of her error to Bacchis: that not long ago her daughter had lost a ring which was a replica of Bacchis's. And now it becomes possible for us to think over again the thoughts of that Greek Bacchis, when she left Myrrina's house. She knew that Myrrina had removed her daughter from her husband's home, that she had tried to keep her confinement a secret, and had wished to kill the child [1]. She had learnt, in the house, about the ring, which Philumena had lost. She had not been told exactly when and how that had happened, but she had been informed that it resembled the ring she wore herself, in a most remarkable way. She had seen such a ring once before, in Pamphilus's hands, on a dreadful evening, a certain number of months before [2], and everything about that evening was painfully vivid in her memory. Again, at the time, she had perfectly understood that Pamphilus must have appropriated that ring in a love-adventure very shortly before. Is it clear now that these data enabled Bacchis to gauge something about which Laches and Phidippus had cudgelled their brains in vain, and to suspect something that was not known to any one except the god and the audience made omniscient by him? She could perfectly gauge the real cause of Myrrina's behaviour, which was unknown to the others. But that the mother and the daughter were the victims of a human error, and that the child's father was not an unknown wretch, but Pamphilus, that was merely a suspicion for Bacchis—although it was a strong suspicion—, but it was not certainty. This suspicion had certainly not tempted her to an immediate disclosure to the two women inside the house. For apart from the fact that she had no right to disclose another person's affair, there would not be utter certainty before Pamphilus could show Philumena's own ring. No wonder then that in her interview with Pamphilus, of which Terence has kept the account [3], Bacchis reminds the youth of his behaviour on the evening in question down to the smallest detail, his drunkenness, the ring which she had seen in his hand, the questions which she had

[1] Verses 748—49.
[2] Cf. Verse 822: abhinc mensis decem fere.
[3] Verses 822 ff.

asked him more and more urgently [1]. Kunst's assertion that it was not really necessary for Pamphilus to be reminded of that [2] does not take into account the character which this scene must have had in the Greek play. I even think it probable that the questions of which Bacchis reminds him here had not been followed by Pamphilus's confession on the evening in question, but only by an evasive reply. Accordingly that unhesitating confession, which we read in Bacchis's *"monodia"* [3], was not an element of the previous history of the Greek play, and Pamphilus's deed was not known to Bacchis as a fact any more than the way in which he had got that ring. What, in Apollodorus's play, Bacchis had tentatively concluded from circumstances, from the youth's behaviour, from his silence, has been made a definitely established fact by Terence, of which Bacchis had a previous knowledge. This fact might help her (and him, the *comicus Latinus* himself) to bring the *"cognitio"* [4] to a happy end without further delay and behind the scenes. It was really almost a matter of course that wearing Philumena's own ring Bacchis must know all that she possibly could of that ring. But any one who changes another person's work always runs a risk of neglecting a detail. In Terence's play Bacchis says in the verses which repeat Pamphilus's confession:

> Homo se fatetur vi in via nescio quam compressisse
> Dicitque sese illi anulum, d u m l u c t a t, detraxisse [5],

but Myrrina had said the following about the loss of the ring:

Ipse eripuit vi, in digito quem habuit, virgini a b i e n s anulum [6].

This small discrepancy in detail is most probably to be ascribed to the adaptator.

As we have seen, the *anagnorisis* in Apollodorus's *Hekyra* was brought about by means of two similar rings, which "drew the one

[1] Cf. verses 823 ff.
[2] *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Kom.*, p. 97.
[3] Verses 828—29. Homo se fatetur vi in via nescio quam compressisse
Dicitque sese illi anulum, dum luctat, detraxisse.
[4] Verse 831.
[5] Verses 828—29. (vi in via, cf. Plaut. *Cistell.* verse 160).
[6] Verse 574.

to the other", ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς εἰς τὸν ὁμοῖον, and ultimately brought together what belonged together, in spite of, we may also say as a result of the misleading nature of their similarity. We know this motif from the reconstruction of the *Adelphoi* [1]), where the "real" ring, the one that is looked for, is found so to say by means of the "other" ring. Just as Micio acted as a "go-between" there, Bacchis did so here. As soon as she began to suspect that the lost ring and the stolen ring must be one and the same, because both were the counterpart of her own ring, she was able to trace Philumena's unknown lover.

It goes, however, without saying that such a striking similarity could not be due to mere chance. No doubt the stage did not deviate too much from real life in this respect, for mass production of ornaments was unknown in that time. The two similar rings in the *Adelphoi* had been the property of the brothers Micio and Demea; in the *Dis Exapaton,* where in my opinion the same motif was used [2]), both rings had belonged to Nicobulus. At the time these rings had been purposely made to be most similar. This must have been exactly the same in the *Hekyra.* But besides this similarity of motif a very important difference is seen in the way in which the motif was used. Here the similarity of the rings was a mystery in itself. For the lost ring (Philumena's) did not return "home" by means of the drawing of its brother who had "remained at home", but due to the operation of a "stray" ring. It is quite beyond doubt that Bacchis, who possessed the stray though effective ring, could not say how, when and why the rings had been made similar to each other, let alone that she should have had a hand in the matter herself. Hence it follows that she did not know whose property the ring had been before she got it. We are here confronted with another secret, besides the secret of Pamphilus's paternity: that of Bacchis's descent. Terence has carefully removed it, but maybe we can succeed in reconstructing it.

Any one who reads the *Hecyra* will, as early as the first scene, be aware of the fact that Bacchis only deserves the name of "*meretrix*",

[1]) See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.* pp. 144 ff.
[2]) See *O.c.* p. 236.

because she is not a *matrona* and not a *virgo*. There can be no doubt about the superiority of her character, we would only wish that she should draw our attention to this a little less emphatically [1]). Her behaviour with regard to Pamphilus's marriage is utterly contradictory to what may be expected from a *meretrix*, and she does not omit to point this out [2])—to our taste with too much self-complacency again. Now it may certainly be remarked that Bacchis's noble-mindedness is necessary for the rôle of pure unselfishness, allotted to her by the requirements of the plot. But if I am not mistaken there are, besides her conduct and self-complacent assertions, still other signs which denote that she does not fully belong to that class of women suggested by the Latin word "*meretrix*". Firstly it is not without importance that this word appears to be a translation of the Greek **ἑταίρα**, as Donatus's quotation at the very first verse of the play shows [3]). This is also the term with which Glykera, Polemon's future wife is indicated in the *Perikeiromene* [4]). Secondly it is evident from the whole of the opening scene that Bacchis's life contrasts favourably with Philotium's, since the latter is apparently guided by the directions of the ancient Syra in love-affairs, whose

[1]) Cf. verses 734—35, 756 ff., 775—76, 816 ff., 834 ff.

[2]) The actual truth regarding her relation to Pamphilus is to be found in verse 752: "segregatum habuisse, uxorem ut duxit, a me Pamphilum." But in comedy truth does not come to light until late in the plot, the driving-power for the action being derived from misinterpretations. The apparent truth is stated in verse 157 (— Quid? interea ibatne ad Bacchidem? — Cotidie.) It describes Pamphilus's inclination during the first months of his marriage to continue his relation with Bacchis. The next verses (158—59) suggest Bacchis's disinclination, but with a certain vagueness, which in the Greek play was to be elucidated afterwards by the exposition of the god. Anyhow, verse 157 shows that there was some reason for gossip and suspicion. At first Phidippus does not appear to believe the gossip, next he admits that it may be true and smooths it over, while eventually he believes it, thinking he can discover a confirmation of what Myrrina had asserted in Pamphilus's attitude. The difficulties which Hildebrandt (*De Hec. Terent. orig.* pp. 23 ff.) raises (cf. Stavenhagen, Hermes 1910, p. 579) are completely removed by the explanations of Siess (Wiener Studien 1907, p. 310) and those of Schadewaldt (Hermes 1931, p. 5).

[3]) 58 f. Phil. Per pol quam paucos reperias meretricibus
Fidelis evenire amatores, Syra.

"sic enim Apollodorus **'ὀλίγαις ἐραστὴς γέγον' ἑταίραις, ὦ Σύρα, βέβαιος'**".

[4]) *Perikeir.* verse 113.

prescriptions are in agreement with those given by Lena to Gymnasium in the first scene of the *Cistellaria.* In this way Bacchis, according to Syra's criticism, becomes of equal worth with Alcesimarchus's future wife, Selenium, who is condemned by Lena. The 2nd scene of the *Hecyra* and subsequent allusions confirm our impression. Two years previously it seemed as though there was a bond for life between Bacchis and Pamphilus [1]). Now this bond has been broken for three quarters of a year, but Laches calls the time he had granted his son a "*longum spatium*" (685) and Phidippus says that the alliance lasted "*tot annos*" (555). If this makes him praise Pamphilus's fidelity [2]), he at once praises Bacchis's fidelity, I think. We may be sure that the nature of this alliance was in agreement with the character of the two people. Bacchis has really nothing in common with her namesake from the *Heauton Timoroumenos* but the name; it is only because of her function in the action that she can be compared with Habrotonon from the *Epitrepontes,* who is generally considered to be her prototype. As far as character goes she is closely related to the Chrysis of Menander's *Samia* and the Chrysis of his *Eunouchos* [3]) or to the Glykera from the *Perikeiromene* mentioned above. These may be more appealing due to their simplicity, they are not superior to her in unselfishness and chastity. Or was she likely to deteriorate when Pamphilus had discontinued his relation with her, and is it a bad omen that when she enters the stage she is accompanied by two slaves? It seems to me to be very probable that these slaves have been added by Terence, as he had to portray a *meretrix,* be it one with a noble heart. The two *ancillae* are only loosely connected with the action. That Bacchis offers her slaves to be put on the rack (773) does not prove that the girls stand beside her. In the text their presence only appears from verse 793: Me sequimini intro huc ambae [4]). But—most curiously!—when Bacchis leaves Phidippus's house the *ancillae* have vanished into space, forgotten as they are by the adaptator who then entirely kept to his model again. And as regards

[1]) Cf. verses 87, (60—62), 97—100.
[2]) Verses 553—56.
[3]) Cf. *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.,* pp. 16 ff.
[4]) Cf. p. 24.

the first point: we should certainly wish to know by what the heroine of Apollodorus's play has lived after Pamphilus had left her. Perhaps the *deus ex machina* has reassured the Greek audience about this point [1]. However that may be, even in Terence's play no proof positive of deterioration is to be found [2]. On the contrary, it is remarkable that, hearing Philotis's words, one might be inclined to think that the breach with Pamphilus did not take place many months before, but only a few days [3], and that the paternal Laches thinks it necessary to remind Bacchis of her future [4].

All these symptoms go far indeed to make us see again in this figure, too, of the **Νέα Κωμῳδία**, one of those young women who had been expelled from society because their descent was unknown. In Terence's play her attitude has still got an element of *noblesse oblige,* which shows that she certainly realises the value of her descent, although it was enigmatical. So she was a foundling and she knew it.

The question who her mother was is not difficult to answer. There are only two women in the play old enough to be her mother, Sostrata and Myrrina. Sostrata, Pamphilus's mother, cannot have been the mother of Pamphilus's concubine. It follows that Myrrina was Bacchis's mother. The very course of the play even shows how the finger of Fate pointed to her. For why had she of all others to recognize or to imagine to recognize Bacchis's ring, and not Philumena or Phidippus? The question Myrrina puts to Bacchis: "how did you get that ring" [5] had no doubt a double meaning in the Greek play, which was partly revealed partly kept a secret by the interrogator. For Myrrina's meaning was: "Is this the ring which was lost by Philumena, or can it be 'the other'?" The former meaning she was to state afterwards, the latter she kept to herself. So the other ring, too, came from her. And it may be easily guessed why she divested herself of that ring and of her little daughter.

1) From verse 685 we conclude that Bacchis enjoyed a certain prosperity when Pamphilus forsook her.

2) What occurs in 735, 756, 834—36 is either spoken in a general sense or alludes to the possibility that she might win back Pamphilus.

3) See verses 58, 97 ff.

4) Verse 746.

5) Cf. verse 831: rogat unde sit.

When she was a girl the same thing had happened to her which was to happen to Philumena afterwards; she, too, had been violated by a stranger one dark evening [1]. But from the evident difference in age between Bacchis and Philumena we may conclude that after Myrrina's accident a considerable time had passed before she was married to Phidippus.

If we may consider that it has been proved that the complication of the Greek *Hekyra* led up to a double recognition, and that it was brought about by means of two similar rings, quite a series of questions crops up about the way in which Apollodorus has treated his subject. It is a rather precarious undertaking to reply to those queries, because in the dénouement Terence has his own way, and throughout has carefully removed the traces of the original *donnée*. Nevertheless—although for this reason a reconstruction remains uncertain at many points—, it is useful for the argument, because it may show that Apollodorus by no means lacked the material for a normal continuation and conclusion.

Those queries then are the following: Did it also appear who was Bacchis's father, and in what way was his identity brought to light? When did Myrrina begin to suspect, when and how did she ascertain that Bacchis was her daughter? What made her admit this to her husband and under what circumstances was a public acknowledgment of this pre-marital daughter possible? When was Bacchis sure that Myrrina was her mother, and how could it be proved that she was the legal possessor of Myrrina's ring? In conclusion: are we right in considering that Laches played a part in the development of this complicated case of recognition?

It will appear to be impossible to answer the whole series of questions in the order in which they were set, because many of them overlap, but in any case we shall begin with the first.

That it was discovered who Bacchis's father was is really self-evident. Otherwise her recognition would not only be incomplete, but perfectly useless, because no acknowledgement could follow. Fortunately it appears from Terence's play that there was a possi-

[1]) No doubt the plot of Menander's *Heros* was based on a similar repetition. For his *Adelphoi* see: *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, p. 141.

bility to discover him. When Myrrina desperately bewails the misfortune that has befallen her daughter and speaks about the unknown assailant, she uses words which seem to be didactic rather than plaintive:

Neque detractum ei est quicquam, qui post possit nosci qui siet:
Ipse eripuit vi, in digito quem habuit, virgini abiens anulum [1]).

As I have said before [2]), Schadewaldt thinks the "*Ethos*" of these verses contrary to the tone of Myrrina's complaint. On account of their matter-of-factness he considers this passage as a piece of information, exclusively meant for the audience, a piece of information which brings along the only function it has from its place of origin. That function, according to Schadewaldt, is the preparation to the *anagnorisis,* and the place of origin is the prologue. In my opinion Schadewaldt's conclusion is erroneous. Surely the god of the "prologue" had no reason to introduce into his narration about Philumena that which had n o t happened to her. So Terence must have found the verses which he translated here, in this very place, Myrrina's verses, also in the Greek play. If so, what was the idea of that contrast of yes-and-no in Myrrina's train of thought, which contrast, in Terence's play, causes the tone of these verses to be so schoolmasterly, as if she were giving lectures in the use of signs of recognition in comedy? And why did Myrrina speak about Philumena's robbery at that point, which fact was already known to the Greek audience? Not in order to explain fully what was already known to everybody, but so as to display the great cruelty of that one misfortune which was pursuing herself and her daughter in a double form. Philumena was not even given that slight chance of rehabilitation, at which she, Myrrina, had once caught, the possession of a means of recognition, an object that had belonged to her assailant. She could not, I think, choose any better words to express the extent of her affliction, nor any words in which the subtle irony of the **'Αγαθὴ Τύχη** was more clearly audible. For exactly this loss of Philumena's ring contained the germ of a double rehabilitation.

No matter whether these verses of Terence's are accepted as a

[1]) Verses 573—74.
[2]) Page 7 note 4.

proof or not—, if one considers it as a fact that Bacchis's father was discovered, one will not be able to doubt whether he was the first owner of the ring worn by her. For why should other means of recognition, which one does not see, be looked for, while the means that one does see commends itself by its simplicity? Consequently, if Myrrina had wrested a ring from her assailant, and having given it to the little Bacchis had kept a replica to herself all the same, she must have had that second ring made herself, so as to keep a **σύμβολον**. Further we see that she did not lock away the ornament, for Philumena has worn it. From this follows that Phidippus was not Bacchis's unknown father. For if the one ring—which Bacchis had got—was originally his, he must have recognized Philumena's ring, its replica. In this case everything would have been cleared up between Myrrina and himself years before, and Bacchis would certainly have immediately been interrogated during her visit and accepted as the lost daughter. And then Apollodorus's *Hekyra,* too, would have been finished after three acts and a final scene.

Consequently Phidippus was not Bacchis's father. Laches was even less likely to be her father, for then he would have had two wives in the end and Myrrina two husbands. What we really want to find is Bacchis's father without a husband for Myrrina into the bargain. The latter is undesirable, even highly undesirable. How are we to find the one and avoid the other? This can be accomplished by looking among the dead. In fact Terence's text provides us with a deceased *senex*: Phanias of Imbros, Laches's cousin, an old epicurean, who has kith nor kin [1]). He indeed was Bacchis's father.

In the Latin play the situation regarding this cousin in Imbros is as follows. He dies when Pamphilus has been married for some months [2]), and Laches sends his son to fetch the inheritance. In this story there is a hitch, which justifies the surmise that Terence has simplified it to suit his convenience. For this simple affair Pamphilus stays away for 5 full months, at a moderate estimation [3]), although

[1]) See verses 171, 458 ff.

[2]) See verses 164—172, 393—94, and compare the next note.

[3]) This is my answer to the last of four questions already touched upon by Donatus regarding the time of: a. Philumena's violation, b. the wedding, c. the beginning of the marital intercourse, d. Pamphilus's departure to Imbros. Donatus's answer runs (ad verse 393): a. 9 months (*menses*) previ-

he hates to leave home and is longing to return (Verses 173, 283). Therefore I think that regarding this point in the previous history

ously; b. 7 months previously; c. 5 months previously; d. 3 months previously. Consequently, when in 529—31 Phidippus says to Myrrina that there was no reason for keeping the confinement a secret, *"praesertim quom et recte et tempori suo pepererit"*, he means — according to Donatus — that the newly-born child is a 7 months' child. Hildebrandt (*De Hecyrae Terentianae origine*, 1884, pp. 29 ff.), however, arrives at the following figures: a. 10 months (*menses*), cf. verse 822; b. about 9 months, cf. verse 531; c. about 7 months, cf. verse 394, where, he argues, the expression *"postquam ad te venit"* does not refer to the beginning of the official marriage, but of the marital intercourse. About d. Hildebrandt does not give his opinion. It will have to be admitted, I think, that h i s figures are acceptable, while those of Donatus are not, at least to ordinary people. The latter would think Phidippus's judgment *(recte et suo tempore)* rather strange to say the least, if the time of b. is put at 7 months. Nevertheless Schadewaldt has given a detailed defence of Donatus's chronology (Hermes 1931, pp. 2 ff.), apparently because he was of opinion that the *Hekyra* was not written for ordinary people but for medical men. He arrives at the following conclusions: a. the child was a normal 9 to 10 months' child; b. Phidippus considered it to be Pamphilus's 7 months' child; c. it had to be considered as a bastard by Pamphilus, as a viable child could not be a πεντάμηνος. Schadewaldt derives his apparently strongest argument from Pamphilus's reaction on beholding Philumena: *"facinus indignum"* (verse 376). Schadewaldt argues: "if the time was about 7 months Pamphilus would have no reason for his grieved indignation, since he could know that 7 months' children are by no means rare". Quite so! But a miscarriage is not rare either. And at the moment when Pamphilus sees his wife *the child was not yet born*. (Cf. verse 392). Consequently even if c. is 5 months, he has no objective reason for his grieved fury, but should have suspended his opinion until the child was born and the age of the foetus had been ascertained. In that case he would have acted with the sober coolness of a medical man or the *medicinae forensis peritus*, which quality Schadewaldt ascribes to him. But Pamphilus's reaction is based on feeling; in fact the poet does not give him an opportunity to use his brains, and he understands the art of creating the proper atmosphere. This is very clear from verses 314—326 and the continuation of the story, from 361 onward. Philumena has fled to her mother and is suffering from an inexplicable illness. There is an air of oppressive mysteriousness in the house, which Pamphilus notices at once (369—370). Then he suddenly stands face to face with his wife and sees with his own eyes what she had evidently wished to keep a secret from him for ever. Even now she does not say a word to justify herself. I think that the signs of a guilty conscience are so abundant here that Pamphilus would have been justified in imagining the worst even if he had never learnt to count. And Myrrina does not give him time to consider any other possibility; she immediately makes a full confession (verses 378 ff.). Therefore it seems to me that we have to accept Hildebrandt's figures unconditionally. This makes verse 531 easier to understand. Phidippus says to Myrrina (527—31) that her unnecessary myste-

there was in all probability the following difference between Terence and his source. Apollodorus had the old "legacy uncle" request Laches to send somebody to Imbros, because probably he had not much longer to live. And, as a housemate of Phanias's during the last months of his life Pamphilus got ample opportunity to listen to his confidences. One confidence elicits another, and he returned with the knowledge that, during a nocturnal adventure in his youth, Phanias had lost a ring which was quite similar to the one that h e had possessed since h i s nocturnal adventure "ten months" previously. Thus the voyage to Imbros caused Pamphilus's ring to be "charged" with the power of a twofold *anagnorisis*. For, since Pamphilus also knew the other ring, that of Bacchis, he could not but realise that either the unknown girl he had robbed of her ring or else Bacchis was Phanias's daughter. When therefore it was disclosed to him by Bacchis's interrogation that the unknown girl was Philumena, Phidippus's own daughter, he could, on his side, say to Bacchis: "Phanias was your father".

In this way Bacchis's *anagnorisis* was only half completed, how-

riousness gives the impression that Philumena has something to conceal, while on the other hand the child has not come too early. For Laches this latter circumstance was so obvious that he does not waste a word over it. (Cf. 631, 642 ff.). This was indeed one of the first requirements of the substruction. For if it had been possible for the thought to occur to Laches that Pamphilus might have some sort of reason to doubt the legitimacy of the child, the whole structure of the action would have been spoilt. On the ground of all these considerations the words "*ad te venit*" of verse 394 will also have to be interpreted in the way which Hildebrandt suggests, although this may be unusual, so that the "*septimus mensis*" mentioned there has to be added to the "*duo menses*" of 393. It is the opinion of many scholars that these two verses are an interpolation, as they interrupt the grammatical connection rather badly. I take them to be Terence's insertion, which has been distilled from the communications of the *deus-monologue*. Finally the following remarks may be made with regard to point d. In verses 397—400 Myrrina says to Pamphilus: "if anything transpires about the confinement I will say that it was an abortion,... the child will immediately be removed". It will only be possible to use this lie, if Pamphilus had not left longer than 5 or 6 months before. Not longer, but not much shorter either. For it follows from verses 164—173 that he must have been sent to Imbros fairly soon after the lapse of the "*duo menses*" mentioned in 393. A general consideration also leads us to this conclusion. If a time shorter than 5 months is assumed, it becomes incomprehensible that Pamphilus had not noticed his wife's pregnancy before his departure. The conclusion that he stayed away for 5 or 6 months is imperative.

ever. For it is unthinkable that Myrrina had explained matters to Bacchis. Although the conversation made it clear to her that the *hetaira* wore the ring of her repudiated child and had worn it from her youth, that was no reason for acknowledging that *hetaira* as her daughter. A child may die, a ring remains and is slipped on the finger of another child. Was it not more preferable even for Myrrina to imagine things of that nature than acknowledging the girl, which involved a chance of deceit and the necessity of a humiliating confession to Phidippus?

Nor could Bacchis do anything but remain passive. She must have concluded from Myrrina's embarrassment that the latter knew or suspected something about the origin of her ring and at any rate she spoke to herself about it while waiting for Pamphilus. But his disclosure of her father's name did not enhance the chance that she would discover her mother.

For the gradual completion of this part of the *anagnorisis* the poet had therefore to employ a subordinate figure. This need evidently made him create the *Nutrix,* whom Terence, as we have seen above[1]), puts upon the stage as a supernumerary in an earlier stage of the action. If, in the Greek play, as we have assumed, Phidippus had really gone to fetch that *Nutrix* at the end of III [2]), it is just natural that he should return with her in IV as soon as the action made that desirable, that is to say immediately after the end of the scene between Pamphilus and Bacchis, but before Bacchis had left the stage. It was easy to account for the fact that Phidippus still found her there, but not his son-in-law, for Pamphilus must be burning to go to Philumena, but Bacchis had still many themes for after-consideration. Phidippus must have begun to ask her how his wife and his daughter had taken her "solemn declaration", and as a reply to that question must have learned what had been the real reason for Myrrina's behaviour and what wonderful discovery had changed unhappiness into happiness. On that occasion Bacchis could not but have spoken of the two similar rings and have shown her own ring. If the *Nutrix* was as well-informed as *nutrices* always are in Comedy, and if consequently she had known Bacchis since her early youth—

[1]) Page 19.
[2]) See p. 25.

no matter whether she was a wet-nurse [1]) or an old dry-nurse, which *nutrices*, τροφοί and τίτθαι mostly are—then it is conceivable and probable that before entering the house she made a confidential communication to the intrigued Phidippus to this effect: although Bacchis was called a *hetaira*, she was to all intents and purposes of good descent, because she had been found as a baby with the ring. If the 4th act ended at that point, the *anagnorisis* would have been complete, so to say, as the audience could rely on Myrrina's inevitable confession to Phidippus as a result of the further development of matters in the house.

In the final act, which then followed, Laches no doubt returned from his vain search for the fugitive Pamphilus [2]). It is difficult to say what was exactly the means by which Apollodorus brought father and son together on the stage. He might have Pamphilus come out of Phidippus's house to announce his joy, like Chaerea in the *Eunouchos* [3]), or merely to go to Sostrata, who was also bound to hear his great news. In view of the rôle of eternal errand-boy, which Parmeno has in the *Hecyra*, I think it most probable that Laches called Parmeno outside, asked him whether he knew where Pamphilus was, got the reply "with Philumena" [4]), and then told the slave to fetch the boy. At any rate Laches and Pamphilus had some business to attend to. For now that it had appeared that Phanias, "the legacy uncle", had a daughter, even though she was illegitimate, and that the daughter was called Bacchis, Pamphilus will not have omitted to point out to his father that she had reasonable claims of a financial nature. And it might be surmised that Apollodorus purposely caused Laches, who was not very open-handed, to bind

[1]) This seems to follow from verses 767—69:

P h i d. Nil apud me tibi
Defieri patiar, quin quod opus sit benigne praebeatur.
Sed quom tu eris satura atque ebria, ut puer satur sit facito.

[2]) See p. 25. We need not be surprised that Laches does not succeed in finding the youth, whereas Parmeno succeeded at once. Servants are cleverer in such things than fathers.

[3]) Cf. Ter. *Eun.* verses 1031—33, 1044—49. See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, pp. 49—50.

[4]) That was exactly what Parmeno knew. Cf. verse 809.

himself to a certain liberality as a result of his declarations of benevolence, friendship and helpfulness towards Bacchis [1]).

This scene may have been followed by one in which Myrrina confessed the secret she had always been silent about to Phidippus. In the fragments of the *Heros* [2]) there is an analogous conversation between an aged husband and his wife and in my opinion something similar may be assumed in the final act of the *Synaristosai,* which has been expunged by Plautus [3]). But there the result was of a more joyful nature, because the man found back his own daughter. The good-natured [4]) Phidippus was for the time being greatly inconvenienced by Myrrina's confession, which was inevitable and evidently wrung from her by himself: he could not possibly accept as a stepdaughter a child that an unknown assailant had by her, however much his understanding of and compassion with his wife's misfortune had been widened by what had befallen to Philumena and had taken a favourable turn there. Only Laches could provide a way out of the difficulty. We may therefore surmise that, after Pamphilus had gone to his mother, Laches had overheard the interview between Phidippus and Myrrina as an involuntary witness. And he had a good excuse for the indiscretion and for his subsequent interference; for he knew who Bacchis's father was, and he himself was that father's legal heir. After what had preceded [5]) it may be expected that he undertook to marry her off.

One more scene may be added. Parmeno was called anew to fetch Bacchis a second time. On arriving she found Myrrina and Laches on the stage, of whom the latter greeted her as his ward, the former as her daughter. No doubt she has confidently entrusted her future to their hands.

The 4 scenes of the 5th act, which I have sketched here, are a result of guesswork and fancy, but only as far as form goes, not as

[1]) 761 benevolus, 764 nostra utere amicitia, ut voles, 766 amicus qualis sim aut quid possiem.

[2]) Verses 55 ff. J., where, wrongly I think, Jensen places Pheidias opposite Myrrina, not Laches.

[3]) *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.,* p. 201.

[4]) Verses 244—45, 247—50, 271, 667.

[5]) See note 1.

regards the contents generally. I have purposely given, as was my intention, a detailed reconstruction, in order to make it perfectly clear that Apollodorus did not lack the material for an extensive development, and that this development was not only possible but even indispensable. For it contained the consequences of the *anagnorisis,* not the automatical results but the moral consequences drawn by the *dramatis personae,* which accordingly depended on their wish and their morality. This is indeed quite different from an unnecessary and dull repetition of what is already known. And therefore it is an established fact that Terence's words:

> placet non fieri hoc itidem ut in comoediis,
> Omnia omnes ubi resciscunt [1]),

have not been translated from the Greek *Hekyra.*

Apollodorus's *anagnorisis-act,* too, his 4th act, appeared to be accessible by means of guess-work only, at least in the final scene, although I think it very probable that the *Nutrix* has played a part there. I think that we may consider it a fact that the great recognition-scene, the 2nd scene of this act, was played by Bacchis and Pamphilus after a monologue by herself; also that that "recognition" was a real discovery based on the blending of the partial knowledge of the two characters to one whole of a new truth, which was thus revealed. This is only possible if the means of recognition in the Greek play was a c o u p l e of similar rings, not o n e ring that had belonged to Philumena and was worn by Bacchis. For if the last mentioned case were the true one, the *anagnorisis*—a simple recognition—would have issued ready-made from the entr'acte after the 3rd act in Apollodorus's play just as we find it in Terence's. So the reconstruction of the original *donnée* is based in the first instance on the analysis of the structure of the Latin adaptation and on the fact, which I think is a well-established one, that at verse 799 of that adaptation we have got no farther than the beginning of the 4th act of the Greek model.

It is not necessary to demonstrate that this model with its intricate *donnée* has had a *deus-exposition*; for this is even accepted by those who are of opinion that Terence's *Hecyra,* apart from this

[1]) Verses 866—67.

one element, is a fairly accurate imitation of Apollodorus's [1]. The reason why Terence discarded that monologue of the deity must have been his aversion from this undramatic means of the Greek drama, which aversion he had already shown in the *Andria* and which he has never since given up. Therefore his *Hecyra* lacks even the undercurrent of gentle humour, which in the Attic *Hekyra* was certainly audible to the audience, because the secrets were known beforehand. But I purposely use the word humour, in the modern sense of a mild compassion smiling a while with moist eyes. This can no longer be called "*vis comica*" in the sense I attached to it in Menander's plays [2]. Just amusing was only the slave Parmeno in the Greek play, which he remained in Terence's comedy. But could anything rouse a sense of mockery in the spectator when seeing those noble characters, the helpless Sostrata, the desperate Myrrina, the tortured Pamphilus, the old men devoting themselves to the good of others, despite the fact that he knew that they were the victims of secrecy and error, against which he had already been warned himself? Really, there was not far more reason to laugh here than there is always and everywhere when seeing the "*Mensch in seinem Wahn*".

The omission of the revealing monologue made it necessary for Terence to halve the *anagnorisis* and limit its form to the utmost. I do not think he was sorry for that omission. On the contrary, to him it was a desired necessity, not only a result but also an aim in itself. This is proved again by a comparison with the *Andria*. For just as Terence had curtailed the rôle of *Tyche* with her romantic means of recognition [3], he did so here, too, and, one might say, not without reason, for what happened in the Greek *Hekyra* through

[1] Schadewaldt's opinion (Hermes 1931, p. 6) that Pamphilus's account of his interview with Myrrina (verses 378 ff.) replaces a dialogue spoken on the stage in the original play, is discarded by Jachmann (*R.E.* Va 640); rightly, I think. Terence, a lover *par excellence* of dramatic action no doubt replaced an original dialogue only in case there was an urgent reason to do so. But such a reason is not to be found here.

After my reconstruction of the two-ring motif I need not refute Jachmann's opinion, that it is not probable that such an insignificant thing as a ring will have been mentioned in the "prologue".

[2] See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, pp. 10 ff.

[3] See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, pp. 108 ff.

Tyche's favour was certainly very casual. Nor can he have regretted the fact that he had to leave Bacchis what she was, a *meretrix*. For he was the same Terence who had not wished to leave the shadowy bride of the *Andria* without consolation and had provided her with a contaminated bridegroom. Should he rehabilitate Bacchis then, no husband being at her disposal, and bestow on her the titles to which she had a right in Greece: illegitimate daughter to a respectable matron and former mistress of the husband of her half-sister? It seems to me that he was right not to do so. There is little chance that a Roman audience would have appreciated such a dénouement very much. On the contrary, his *Hecyra* after having been a failure immediately for the first time and after a successful beginning for the second time, would probably have been hissed off the stage at the end of the third performance.

II

THE ORIGINAL OF TERENCE'S PHORMIO

The literature about the original of Terence's *Phormio* is for the greater part concerned with speculations regarding the title. Donatus's assertion that the name of Apollodorus's play was **Ἐπιδικαζομένη**, not **Ἐπιδικαζόμενος** [1]), is generally considered to be erroneous. But whether the term **Ἐπιδικαζόμενος** referred to Phormio, the sycophant, or to Antipho, who made believe that he had the beautiful Phanium thrust upon him through a legal action—to that question the answer is not absolutely unanimous [2]). We may safely leave this on one side, as for our investigation it is sufficient to know that Phanium was awarded to Antipho as a wife by **ἐπιδικασία,** on the ground, invented by Phormio, that as her nearest relation it was his duty to marry her. There is not the least doubt about that.

No one has as yet examined the way in which Terence has adapted his model, whether he has changed it, where he did so and to what extent. At least there has not been such an examination in the years when a more extensive knowledge of the Greek **Νέα** had broadened the basis of such investigation [3]). We have to be satisfied with some isolated notes and indications. Kunst, for example, remarks [4]) that Terence was not very clever when he introduced a youth into the previous history of the *fabula,* who speaks as if he were a future adorer of Phanium's [5]). But Kunst rightly adds

[1]) Donatus ad versum 25: Manifeste hic errat Terentius; nam haec fabula quam transtulit *Epidicazomene* dicta est a puella, de qua iudicium est, cum sit alia fabula *Epidicazomenos* eiusdem Apollodori, debuit ergo dicere *"Epidicazomenen".*

[2]) See Kunst, *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Kom.* pp. 152 ff.; Jachmann, *R. E.* Va 641.

[3]) Jachmann *l.l.:* „Im übrigen liegen keine Anhaltspunkte dafür vor, dass T. namhafte Umgestaltungen vorgenommen habe." Of the older investigations I mention: F. V. Fritzsche, *De Graec. font. Terenti,* Spec. II; F. Nencini, *De Terentio eiusque fontibus* pp. 109 ff.

[4]) *O. c.* p. 150[1].

[5]) *Phormio* verses 91 ff.

that not too much value should be attached to the impression which that detail might have made on the audience [1]). An observation of Jachmann [2]), too, is of some importance. He thinks that the use of "Stilpo" as a name for Phanium's fictitious father [3]) is to be considered as an *"Unzuträglichkeit"*. He puts it thus, referring to the similarity with Chremes's false name: "Die Homonymie ist sinnlos und stammt demnach sicher nicht von Apollodor". This name, he continues, is apparently an error of Terence's, a misnomer of the same kind as the mistake he made when in the same play he gave Phaedria's cither-player a name which only decent girls bear in Greek comedies: Pamphila. It seems to me that Jachmann is mistaken. When Sophrona was looking [4]) for Phanium's protector in Athens, Chremes's false name, Stilpo, was the only thing for her to go by. Consequently it was reasonable and unavoidable for her to mention to Antipho the name of that unfindable Stilpo. What could have been more obvious for Phormio than to mention "Stilpo" in the lawsuit, when he needed a name for Demipho's fictitious *cognatus,* whom he had made the girl's father? According to Sophrona Stilpo was an Athenian; there was a relation between him and Phanium of a kind about which she was vague; he appeared to be unfindable. Who could serve better as a sheet-anchor for Phormio's *epidikasia*? Consequently: the homonymy is not homonymy, but identity, so that it is not *"sinnlos"* and decidedly originates from Apollodorus.

More felicitous than Jachmann's conjecture is Tenney Frank's supposition [5]) that the *Epidikazomenos* had an explanatory prologue, which was expunged by Terence. Frank points out that in Terence's play Chremes's Lemnian daughter is not referred to before verses 567—68. Now we may surmise (and I take this for granted now, since it has appeared to me that 5 of his comedies bear this out [6])) that it was Terence's principle not to disclose the secret to the spectator any earlier or in any other way than in and through

[1]) Cf. A. Saekel, *Quaest. com. de Ter. exempl. Gr.* p. 81.
[2]) *L.l.*
[3]) Verses 389—90.
[4]) Cf. verse 747.
[5]) Am. Journ. of Philol. 1928.
[6]) See pp. 7, 47 and cf. *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*

the action itself, whereas the Greek dramatists revealed the key to the secret to the audience by means of a "prologue" *ad hoc,* which secret was for the time being impenetrable to the characters. The course of the action justifies the conviction that this also took place in the Ἐπιδικαζόμενος. Accordingly Terence has expunged that "prologue" here, too [1]). We may add that it was a monologue by a deity and that it occurred at the end of Apollodorus's 1st act, i.e. before verse 153, with which verse the real action of the play begins.

It is, however, improbable in itself that Terence's changes should have ended at the expunction of the god's monologue. For if we were to reconstruct the rôle of the god in the Ἐπιδικαζόμενος from the facts which appear to be "secrets" in the *Phormio,* we should be compelled to offend against his godly dignity. The whole of his disclosure would merely come to this communication: "Antipho's young wife is Chremes's own daughter born of another marriage, which he contracted in Lemnos". That might have been said by the god in three or four verses. To that purpose a god should not be made to appear!

But considerations of a general nature are not adequate as a starting point for a reconstruction. A reconstruction can only be made after an analysis of the contents of the Latin play. Anomalies in composition, unevennesses and inconsistencies of the action and possible rests of discarded elements from the original *donnée,* all this is the material which will have to provide us with a basis for the reconstruction of the Greek play, leading me to three methods of investigation, which I will presently apply in the same order.

The reader, though of course he knows the *Phormio,* will nevertheless allow me, I trust, to remind him of the principal events. Phanium, with her mother and her *Nutrix,* has arrived at Athens from Lemnos, in search of a certain Stilpo, who, it seems, has promised to marry her off [2]). Stilpo is not to be found, it appears, and the mother dies. A young Athenian of good descent, Antipho, meets the girl and falls in love with her. The *Nutrix* points out to him

[1]) Jachmann *l.l.,* too, assumes this on the ground of Schadewaldt's suggestion, Hermes 1931, p. 21[7].

[2]) This m a y at least be deduced from verses 569 ff. See p. 75.

that the only relation possible is a marriage. Though the girl is poor, she is of Attic descent and the child of respectable parents (verses 114—15). Antipho is convinced that his father will not approve of this marriage, but fortunately the father is abroad on a long journey. This enables them to force the marriage by means of a lawsuit. Phormio, the sycophant, acts as plaintiff, and Antipho is condemned to marry Phanium, as he is the nearest relation of her deceased father, to whom Phormio refers as "Stilpo" in Court. Antipho has obtained his end and takes Phanium and her *Nutrix* to his father's house. Not long afterwards—on the day of the play—father Demipho returns, and it appears that he does not intend to put up with what has happened. But Antipho remains in hiding. Demipho only meets Geta, his slave, who was to keep an eye on the son, and his nephew, Phaedria, Antipho's bosomfriend. An interview between them does not make Demipho any the wiser, for both of them are in the plot; and a dispute with Phormio, the sly and brazen sycophant, who promotes Phanium's interests, has even less result. So Demipho resolves to await the return of his brother Chremes, who has gone to the island of Lemnos on business. For there Chremes has a "secret" daughter, whom he was to bring along to Athens as a wife for Antipho. That had been settled with Demipho; and therefore Chremes's wish and will and the result of his voyage to Lemnos will also influence Demipho's ultimate decision.

Meanwhile the others are firmly determined to hold their own. A complication in the situation strengthens their intention. For some months Phaedria has been in love with a little harpist, who is the property of a slave-trafficker, who is willing to sell the child to him for 30 *minae* if he can pay the sum before a fixed date. Now, however, the trafficker threatens to dispose of her to a *miles* even before the evening, unless Phaedria pays at once. This leads Geta to slily make the most of the controversy that is dragging on between Demipho and Phormio, for the benefit of Phaedria. His plan is that Phormio is to pretend that he is willing to marry the woman who had been thrust upon Antipho, if he receives 30 *minae*. Thus the sum of 30 *minae* required for the purchase of the cither-player will be available, which Phaedria will supply through a loan from his

friends, so that in the end Phormio will be able to pay it back to Demipho and refuse to keep his word.

No sooner has Geta made that scheme than Chremes returns from his journey, but without a daughter. She is said to be already in Athens with her housemates and she will certainly not prove to be unfindable. He insists on Demipho keeping the promise he has made. Consequently the brothers make up their minds to do all they can to get rid of Antipho's undesired wife again. It seems as if they will be successful. For Geta, having consulted Phormio just before, comes up to them with the proposal to have an amicable settlement. Chremes is at once willing, and he can pay cash. Then Demipho and Geta start for the market, where Phormio awaits them, in order to receive the money.

When they have gone, Sophrona, the *Nutrix,* rushes from Demipho's house in utter despair. Chremes and she meet and they recognize each other. Her communications make him see what Chance has destined for him: his daughter from Lemnos has been married to Antipho. Full of joy he enters Demipho's house with Sophrona, in order to discuss everything.

Meanwhile Demipho and Geta have made a compromise with Phormio. The last arrangements only remain to be made. For it is desirable for Nausistrata, Chremes's wife, to go to Phanium in order to prepare her for the divorce intended. Accordingly Demipho sends his slave Geta to Phanium, to announce this visit to her, and he himself enters Chremes's house, where he has to persuade Nausistrata to perform the task intended for her. However, when they have left the house together, Chremes is leaving the other house, and as he may only speak in covert terms it is extremely difficult for him to intimate to his brother that a divorce is unnecessary and undesirable. Nevertheless he succeeds in this. Nausistrata, though curious, yet unaware of Chremes's secret, goes back into her house. Not before then can Demipho learn what Chremes has discovered. In order to discuss the further details they retire into Demipho's house.

Instantly Antipho enters the stage, as he has heard that his marriage may after all be continued. He is looking for Geta, who will have to tell him what is the most suitable time to speak to his

father. While he is waiting Phormio appears. The cither-player has been bought and liberated—he informs us—and is already in Phormio's home, with Phaedria. Now all they have to do is to gain time with the old gentlemen. To that purpose Phormio has invented a ruse. But Geta's sudden entrance makes the ruse superfluous. He has used the time spent in Demipho's house to eavesdrop a conversation between Chremes and Phanium and her *nutrix,* so that he knows that Phanium is Chremes's secret daughter. Under the circumstances the fathers would like nothing better than the continuation of the marriage, and they have ordered Geta to fetch Antipho home. Consequently Phormio is left alone on the stage. At once he has made a new scheme in order to save Phaedria the repayment of the money. Presently he gets an opportunity to carry it out. For Demipho and Chremes go to him in order to undo the financial transaction. So Phormio can talk to them on the stage. He declares that he is willing to give up the woman, but that the money will have to remain his. When threatened with a lawsuit he reciprocates by threatening with blackmail. When Chremes seeing that his secret has been betrayed is going to yield, but Demipho persists, Phormio plays his last trump: in a loud voice he calls for Nausistrata. She comes and learns everything, Chremes's bigamy as well as the question of Phaedria's cither-player and the 30 *minae.* She knows no better means to revenge herself on her husband than to approve of what her son has committed. She knows another means besides: she makes her son Chremes's judge. Whereupon, by way of conclusion and in accordance with his character Phormio invites himself to have dinner with her.

In order to be able to critically analyse the action described above two things are necessary: First that one visualises both position and direction of the actors with regard to each portion of the action. Secondly that one understands the structure of the plot, in other words: that one can duly divide it into its 5 acts.

With regard to the first point I have to be brief, so as not to distract attention from the main issue. In my opinion it is certain that there were two houses on the stage, Chremes's to the right of the spectators, Demipho's to the left [1]). The house of Dorio,

[1]) This appears from verses 177 and 194—95. Geta is coming from the harbour, i.e. from the right (see Haigh—Pickard-Cambridge, *The Attic*

the *leno,* was to be imagined in the street seen to the left of the stage [1]) and likewise, a little farther on, Phormio's house [2]).

In order to determine the acts of the *Epidikazomenos* the divisions of Terence's *Phormio* may be used as a starting-point, that is a provisional starting-point [3]). For no one can guarantee that the interludes are reproductions of the original entr'actes. Moreover they do not have any authoritative value even for the Latin play.

Theatre Ch. IV, § 3), on his way to Demipho's house. In 194 he says: "*Domum ire pergam*" and takes to his heels. Then Phaedria says to Antipho: "*Revocemus hominem*". It follows that Geta has rushed past the young people, who are standing before Chremes's house.

[1]) That may be proved with verses 215—18 and 309—10. When Demipho enters the stage coming from the harbour, i.e. from the right, Antipho takes to flight, of course turning to the left. In 309 Phaedria is ordered to fetch him. He leaves the stage with the words: "*Eo: recta via quidem illuc*", and Geta says aside: "*Nempe ad Pamphilam*", that is to say to the house of the *leno.* It follows that the *leno* dwelled in the street seen to the left. This is corroborated in 484—86. Phaedria follows Dorio, who is apparently on his way from home to the centre of the town, so that he passes the stage turning to the right. Geta already sees Phaedria coming when the latter leaves Dorio's house and draws Antipho's attention to him (484). Consequently Sloman is right when he says ad verse 35 (Ter. *Phormio,* Oxford 1899[2]): "Dorio's house is supposed to be within sight". He does not say anything about right or left, nor does he do so in giving the following description of the stage: "The houses of Demipho and Chremes open on to the stage". Hoekstra's description (Ter. *Phormio,* 1894, p. 7) running: "Chremes's house to the left, Dorio's house to the right, Demipho's in the middle", is partly wrong, partly useless, as it is not explicitly stated what is meant by right and left.

[2]) There is in this play much going backwards and forwards between the stage and the places supposed to have been on the right i.e. the harbour and the market, whereas none of the actors was bound to enter from the left because of the situation of the place he came from (viz. from the country or from abroad) or to leave by the left. Therefore it is practically certain that the poet had to place Phormio's house to the left of the stage if he wished to obtain the required balance in the movements of the actors. The following points should be considered in this respect. In 22 places of Terence's play one of the actors (not counting Davos, the *persona protatica*) enters or leaves through a side-passage; 11 times this is bound to be the entrance on the right (verses 152, 179, 231, 314, 348, 458, 462, 533, 567, 727, 766). If we suppose Phormio's house to be on the left of the stage, the entrance on the left is also used 11 times; if it is supposed to be on the right, the ratio becomes 18: 5 (cf. verses 310, 315, 440, 566, 591, 829, 1015; 218, 310, 465, 485, 820).

[3]) See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, p. 39[4].

This appears even from the fact that there can be question, not of one, but of more than one division. It is not known whether Terence has divided his material into acts. Consequently one can only adopt the division made in the *codices* or that made by modern editors [1]. In either case the division has been made tentatively, and it is not impossible that one thus did a thing which Terence had neither meant nor wished.

The *codices* divide the Latin play into the following 5 acts:

I. From the beginning of the exposition to the first entrance of Demipho, verses 35—230.

II. From Demipho's first entrance to Antipho's return, verses 231—464.

III. From Antipho's return to the time immediately before Chremes's entrance, verses 465—566.

IV. From Chremes's entrance to the time immediately before he meets Sophrona, verses 567—727.

V. From Chremes's encounter with Sophrona to the end, verses 728—1055.

At first sight it is clear that only one of the four entr'actes inserted makes an interruption of Terence's action possible, viz. the one at verse 566. For there Geta and Phaedria leave the stage in order to go to Phormio, and after that Demipho and Chremes enter together, in verse 567. But at the other points, at verses 230, 464 and 727, the stage is not cleared before the beginning of the new scene. In the first two places mentioned an actor who is already present even announces that another is going to enter.

It need not surprise us that the editors of Terence have rejected this division. Fleckeisen and Dziatzko transpose the end of I to verse 152, the end of II to verse 314, and the end of IV to verse 765 [2]. Legrand, in his *New Greek Comedy* [3], mentions the same resting-points, verses 152, 314, 566 and 765, which according to him also apply to the *Epidikazomenos*.

It will certainly not be an easy matter to divide Terence's *Phormio*

[1] Vide supra, p. 11.

[2] In Sloman's work (*Phormio*, Oxford 1899[2]) I extends from 35—314, II from 315—566, III from 567—765, IV from 766—893, V from 894—1055.

[3] Page 375.

into 5 acts in a more plausible way. But it does not follow that this division should be in accordance with Apollodorus's disposition. We may safely assume that he had an entr'acte before verse 153, as the real action begins there, the preceding part being the exposition. However, as far as the other three points are concerned the idea of an interlude results either from Terence's text or from the conception which his editors have formed of the action. But the interludes are not unavoidable or indispensable in themselves, nor do they correspond to the natural resting-points in the development of the dramatic narrative. This then is the upshot of what can be said about these three interludes (at 314, 566 and 765). The arguments in support of an entr'acte after verse 314 are especially derived, it seems, from Demipho's strange announcement at the end of the scene [1]. He says he shall enter the house first and then go to the market. From this it is deduced that he leaves for the market "unseen", which fiction is imagined to be possible during an interval in the real play. That is why an entr'acte is inserted here. It is indeed possible that this was Terence's idea, but on the other hand it is certain that this pause is not necessary to cover the duration of Demipho's absence; for, for this purpose the 33 verses of the following scene, the one between Phormio and Geta (verses 315—47), are quite sufficient.—The requirement of an entr'acte between 566 and 567 is based, firstly on the idea that Geta and Phaedria will run into Demipho and Chremes if the one couple leaves the stage at the same moment when the other couple enters, secondly on the opinion that the total change of actors always coincides with the end of an act. But this opinion is not based on any dramatic law of the Greek comedians [2], and now that we know that Geta with Phaedria, on their way to Phormio, turned to the left, while the two old gentlemen entered from the right, it is as clear as the sun that any danger of a collision was out of the question.—Nor was the state of affairs at 765 a coercive necessity for Apollodorus to

[1] 311—314 Ego deos penatis hinc salutatum domum
Devortar: inde ibo ad forum atque aliquot mihi
Amicos advocabo, ad hanc rem qui adsient,
Ut ne inparatus sim, si adveniat Phormio.

[2] Vide supra pp. 13, 15; *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.* p. 127[3].

have an interlude, as the clearing of the stage was no reason for him to insert an entr'acte.

It will be necessary to discuss this question more fully and extensively.

From the investigation of Menander's plays it has appeared to us that the entr'acte fulfilled a double task in his composition. It could mark the lapse of time of an event which was supposed to be continued behind the scenes. But this was not its principal task. Its most important function was of a structural nature. It served to divide the dramatic narrative into its natural parts, so that the 1st act gave the exposition [1]), the 2nd the preparation, the 3rd the complication, the 4th the dénouement (*anagnorisis*) and the 5th the ultimate development. We may expect that Menander's disciple, Apollodorus, kept to his master's principle in his composition, and this expectation is borne out by the structure of his *Hekyra,* as we have seen. If we consider where the action begins in the *Phormio,* where it is ripe for the complication, where the dénouement commences and at what point that dénouement is eventually developed to its logical conclusions, we shall have to conclude that Apollodorus's 2nd act began at verse 153, the 3rd act at verse 465 and the 4th at verse 728 (727); about the 5th act it can be provisionally stated that it probably began at verse 829 and at any rate not previous to verse 820. The view put forward here requires detailed argumentation.

That Apollodorus's 2nd act began at verse 153 may be considered as an established fact after what I have said above. But that its end was just before verse 465 may be considered unacceptable by the reader in view of the contents of Terence's text at this point. Therefore I will enhance the probability of this thesis by adducing more coercive arguments than were put forward above to show that Apollodorus certainly did not have an entr'acte at verse 314.

I have already said that the scene between Phormio and Geta (315—47) is sufficient to explain the duration of Demipho's absence.

[1]) From the fragments of the *Perikeiromene* and from the so-called *Fragmenta Florentina* it appears that Menander has not invariably placed the second exposition, that of the god, at the end of the first act. But in his *Synaristosai* the exposition of the god undoubtedly formed the end of the first act, as appears from the Latin adaptation, the *Cistellaria.*

However, that was understatement. The scene in question was purposely destined to that end and calculated to cover the lapse of time. Why does Phormio do nothing but repeat, in the form of a question, in the opening lines, what he knew already; why does he next emphatically declare that to be his task which Geta and himself and every one of the audience consider to be his task; why does he next turn to an exposition of his character, only to end with a kind of lecture on parasitical philology? Why is this scene, however amusing it may be, so full of irrelevant things? Only, of course, in order to cover the duration of Demipho's absence. This explains why the dialogue has been purposely drawn out, but if an entr'acte had preceded it, this extension would have been superfluous [1].

But, it may be objected, although that conversation gives Demipho time to fetch *Advocati* from the market, the four verses spoken by himself before going (311—14) are not sufficient to properly explain the duration of Geta's walk to Phormio and back. That is indeed the case. Apollodorus would no doubt have thought those four verses insufficient [2]. Moreover Demipho's strange action to which I have referred suggests an entr'acte to the reader. But I would ask: did the Greek Demophon enter the house to greet his "*dei penates*"? Certainly not. In order to do that he should first have become a Latin Demipho, on the stage in Rome. But in Athens he could express his greeting and thanks for his safe return to the Agyieus standing at his front-door [3]. I venture to assert that this perfectly explains the action at this point, as it must have occurred in the Greek play. Demipho did not enter the house; rightly, for even the thought of the possibility of meeting Phanium and Sophrona should not occur to the spectators [4]. He expressed his greeting and

[1]) According to Donatus's note on verse 339 Terence's source of what is said there was not Apollodorus but Ennius (*Sat.* VI fr. 1 M = verses 14—19 V^2). (Cf. Nencini, *De Ter. eiusque font.*, p. 112). It does not follow, however, that the Greek text was more concise here than the Latin text. Moreover only 2 or 3 verses correspond to Ennius's fragment.

[2]) Is Terence likely to have had the same opinion? I am by no means sure of that. See e.g. *Heaut. Tim.*, verse 170, verses 502 and 508.

[3]) See Reisch, *Agyieus (R.E.* I 910 ff.), where all the places are mentioned that prove the presence on the stage of symbol, image or altar of Agyieus.

[4]) Consequently Demipho did not enter the house until after verse 819, when Chremes had already discovered his daughter.

prayer of thanks in the street and this at such length that Geta had time enough to fetch Phormio from his house [1]). And finally he went in the direction of the market, to the right, and at the same moment Phormio and Geta entered the stage, from the left. So the action of the *Epidikazomenos* was not interrupted before Phormio entered, and with good reason. For his debate with Demipho (verses 348 ff.) is not the first important moment of a new chapter, but it decides the battle, which had already been prophesied in 177 by Geta's alarm. In the first encounter Phaedria and Geta bore the brunt of the battle and checked the enraged father in his first onrush, but now Phormio repulses the attack. Their duel makes the situation ripe for the complication.

In my opinion there can be no doubt but that the complication formed the theme of the 3rd act. The complication was already foreshadowed by the entrance of Phaedria and Dorio in verse 485. The preceding scene, of Antipho and Geta (465—84), is indissolubly connected with their entrance, for Antipho and Geta are indispensable to the interview between Phaedria and the *leno*. Consequently Apollodorus's 3rd act can—I repeat it— only have begun at verse 465. He had no interlude before verse 315, consequently he had an entr'acte before 465. This leads me to the second (positive) part of my argumentation.

As I have said above, it is not immediately evident from Terence's text in 463—65 that an old entr'acte lies hidden here. Geta says in verse 463 that he is going to look for Antipho [2]). The old man has just left for the harbour [3]), so that they are free in their movements again. But lo! Antipho is approaching of his own accord! [4]) Is he? No, Terence can no longer gull us. That dodge of his when he wishes to get rid of an entr'acte he does not like, we had known all along: just insert a line and that job is jobbed. Terence does the same thing in the *Andria,* just as it is done here and at the same point

[1]) Cf. also verse 440.
Phorm. Siquid opus fuerit, heus, domo me. Get. Intellego.

[2]) Geta. At ego Antiphonem quaeram, ut quae acta hic sint sciat.

[3]) Verses 460—62. Dem. Frater est expectandus mihi:
Is quod mihi dederit de hac re consilium, id sequar.
Percontatum ibo ad portum, quoad se recipiat.

[4]) Verse 464. Geta. Sed eccum ipsum video in tempore huc se recipere.

in the play, where in the Greek model the 2nd act ended[1]). There old Simo is surprised by Chremes's arrival at the moment he is going to look for Chremes, but in Menander's play Simo really left the stage to return with Chremes at the beginning of the 3rd act, this at once being the commencement of the complication. In this way Geta got an entr'acte from Apollodorus in the *Epidikazomenos* in order to look for Antipho and take him home. We only have to make the slave say to him the words of reproach with which the boy rebukes himself on entering the stage in Terence's play[2]), and we have restored the original state of things. Then Geta, as his Latin congener, informed his young master, and no sooner had he said what results had been obtained and what the matter really depended on, than the complication began with the entrance of Phaedria and Dorio. It is obvious why both Antipho and Geta had to be present at Phaedria's interview with the *leno* and listen to his passionate protestations. The planning of the ruse which was to help the action to proceed and to arrive at a complication could only be Geta's work. But Antipho had to urge and compel him to it[3]). For Antipho, not Phaedria, is Geta's master, and Antipho's own interests become endangered owing to this scheme, at least seemingly and without Antipho being aware of it himself.

There are numerous arguments to show that this scheme and its execution were the theme of the 3rd act, so that it extended from verse 465 to verse 727, as I pointed out above. They are partly of a general nature and partly they are based on the changes which can easily be recognized in Terence's *Phormio* in this portion. If it appears that it can be proved that the interval which has been pointed out by some critics between verse 566 and verse 567 of his text is merely a seeming interval, the possibility will have to be admitted that in the original the 3rd act ended before 728. If next it appears that at 728 of Terence's text the action is less smooth than is otherwise the case in passing from one scene to another in Terence's plays, the fundamental arguments, too, which I derive

[1]) *Andria* 532. Simo. Atque adeo in ipso tempore eccum ipsum obviam. See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.* pp. 105 ff. Similarly in the *Hecyra,* see pp. 15 ff.

[2]) See verses 465 ff.

[3]) See verses 553—56.

from the narrative, will, I think, have to be accepted. Therefore I will now discuss Terence's verses 566—67 and for convenience' sake I will repeat what I said about it above.

Those critics who, following the editors and the MSS., postulate an entr'acte at this point of the *Phormio,* probably do so as the result of two observations. In the first place they see that between 566 and 567 the stage is cleared; in the second place they notice that the persons leaving the stage, Geta and Phaedria, must by no means meet the two who enter, Demipho and Chremes. Even the idea of a collision outside the stage has to be out of the question. Neither of these two reasons however, that is to say neither the total change of actors, nor the fear of collision made it necessary for Apollodorus to insert an entr'acte here. Such a change within an act was perfectly normal and legitimate, and Geta's destination, Phormio's house, lay to the left, whereas the *senes* came from the harbour which lay to the right. However, the fact that an entr'acte was unnecessary is no proof positive of the action in the Greek play going on without an interlude. But the going on is perfectly clear from Geta's words on his return in 591. He is delighted at Phormio's p e r s p i c a c i t y; the latter understood his cunning scheme before he had explained half of it [1]. This is certainly a compliment for Phormio, but at the same time an explanation, almost an excuse from the side of the poet for the extraordinary rapidity with which Geta had acquitted himself of his task. He had started at verse 566, *"ocius"* it says [2], and 25 verses farther on he is back again! Had Apollodorus prefixed an entr'acte with its unlimited duration to these 25 verses, he would have put Geta's compliment to shame and made himself ridiculous. Whether one wishes to hold that Terence was short-sighted enough to interrupt the action at this point, does not concern us, but that he did not find an interlude in his model is certain. In visualising the scene we see how the old men approaching from the right immediately after Geta's exit, stop at a short distance from Chremes's front-door. For Chremes has returned from a voyage and has a purse full of money. Their deliberations take up 25 verses. Then Geta returns

[1]) Verse 594. Vix dum dimidium dixeram: intellexerat.
[2]) Verse 562.

from the outer left side. No wonder that he can speak nine lines before he discerns Demipho and Chremes. He walks up to them and at the same moment Antipho peeps from behind the door of the house on the left in order to find out whether Geta is coming [1]; his eyes wander to the right and there he discovers his father together with his uncle Chremes. The latter is to decide his fate [2]. Without mentioning Geta at all he steals nearer, conceals himself in the alley, as we may assume[3], and full of amazement and dismay listens to the interview between the slave and the old gentlemen, in which the complication reaches its full development.

The series of scenes beginning at verse 567 in the *Phormio*, is not interrupted at 728, although Donatus thinks there was an entr'acte here. The stage is not cleared till after 765 and therefore Fleckeisen *cum suis* insert a pause at this point. It is superfluous to repeat that there is nothing to compel us to follow their example with regard to the Greek play on this ground. But I admit that the circumstance that an entr'acte was not necessary at this point does not prove that an entr'acte was impossible. If, however, it can be shown that an interlude at 727 is both very conceivable and preferable, it follows that an entr'acte after 765 is impossible. Now it is for one thing remarkable that the scene which begins at verse 728 follows the preceding one without any connection, whereas the other scenes of this series are carefully and closely connected. In the second place, the way in which Chremes suddenly changes the course of his thoughts in 727 is amazing and unparalleled. He urgently asserts that Demipho, on his return from the market, should go and request Nausistrata to see Antipho's wife; Demipho answers: "*Rogabo*"...... [4], then, in a flash, Chremes switches off to another line of thought and sighs:

Ubi illas nunc ego reperire possim, cogito [5].

Immediately afterwards the *Nutrix* comes out of Demipho's house.

The transition is clumsy. It is not customary for the audience to

[1] Verse 606. Expecto quam mox recipiat sese Geta.
[2] Cf. verses 460—61, 480—83.
[3] See verse 891: angiportus.
[4] Verse 727.
[5] Verse 727.

be flung into the *anagnorisis* in such a way. And now I have arrived at those arguments which I derive from the dramatic structure. In all of Menander's plays such as can be reconstructed either from the original fragments or from the Latin imitations, the recognition forms an integrant part of the 4th act. We have seen above that in Apollodorus's *Hekyra,* too, the 4th act was the act of the recognition [1]. It would, therefore, almost be a wonder if in the *Epidikazomenos* he had deviated from a rule which may apparently be considered as one of the laws of dramatic composition. On the other hand all that precedes 727, from verse 465 onward, is scene after scene part of the complication, so that its subject matter belongs to the 3rd act. This is evident if we compare it with the reconstructed schemes of Menander's plays, e.g. those of the *Andria* or the *Heauton Timoroumenos.* The agreement with Apollodorus's other play, his *Hekyra,* the 3rd act of which has been preserved in Terence's verses 451 to 798, is equally striking. In the *Hekyra* the well-meaning fathers try to push an arrangement upon equally good adversaries; in the *Epidikazomenos* Geta-Phormio and their associates offer a hypocritical settlement to Chremes-Demipho in order to take advantage of it without losing what they have already gained. And in either case the *anagnorisis* shows the vanity of all endeavours and counter-endeavours, because fate has already fulfilled what either party would wish for themselves. It is, I hold, unthinkable that in the *Epidikazomenos* Apollodorus has linked the *anagnorisis* to the complication. It must therefore be assumed that, after Demipho's departure in 727, Chremes first entered his house and left it after the interlude of the chorus and met Sophrona.

On the ground of this conclusion it is certain that the first 3 acts of Apollodorus's *Epidikazomenos* have been kept by Terence in verses 35—727 of his *Phormio* [2]. This leaves 325 verses for acts IV and V (verses 727b—1055). How these verses are to be distributed over the two acts is not clear at the outset. Of course, if 727a was the last verse of III, the 5th act cannot have begun as early as verse 766, where Terence V does begin in Fleckeisen's division. For in that case Apollodorus IV would be represented in the Latin

[1]) Pp. 10—19, 25 ff.

[2]) "Rogabo" (verse 727a) belonged to III.

play by one scene of less than 40 verses (727b—765). That would mean that Terence had deleted the bulk of the 4th act, say about 150 verses. This is impossible. But he does seem to have deleted something in this part—"as was customary with him", we would almost say. For, as I have pointed out before, the end of the Greek 4th act cannot have been farther than at about verse 820. For Phormio's arrival in verse 829 means that the action of the comedy has reached its last stage. If the 5th act began somewhere here, then there are about 100 verses left for IV, which is certainly not enough to preclude any thought of the adaptator's change. Therefore it will be necessary to carefully consider all the symptoms of possible changes [1]).

On close examination we shall indeed discover in the *Phormio* quite a series of unevennesses, inconsistencies and absurdities. Although we cannot ascribe all of these to the adaptator, yet, if I am not mistaken, the greater part was made by him. I shall enumerate them all and shall next try to fix the debit-balance of the two poets, Apollodorus and Terence. Here is their register of sins.

1. There is no reason for Antipho's and Phaedria's entrance in 153.

2. It remains unexplained how Demipho can have learnt all the details of the law-suit and the marriage on his way from the harbour before 231. (Cf. verses 236, 237, 279—81, 298, 305 and 307).

3. In his dialogue with Geta (315—45) Phormio asks after things he knows already and speaks about irrelevant matters.

4. It is not quite natural that Demipho informs Geta of his further plans in 460—62. (Cf. 480—81).

5. There are no good grounds for Antipho's spontaneous return in 465.

6. One would expect that, on their way, Demipho and Chremes had already spoken about the subjects which they discuss as new topics in 567 ff. (Cf. 567—76, 577 ff.).

[1]) I leave on one side the change in verses 91 ff., which Donatus points out, and the explanation as given in verses 125—26 which was apparently meant for the Roman audience. What Nencini (*De Ter. eiusque font.* pp. 109 ff.) says about verses 235—38 and 292 ff. is an exaggeration, I think.

7. Chremes has already heard about Antipho's marriage without the intermediary of Demipho (577 ff.).

8. Although Chremes (740 ff.) forbids Sophrona to call him by the name of "Stilpo", he keeps his real name a secret from her, and the reason for this secrecy does not become clear later on.

9. Sophrona is to keep the fact that Phanium is Chremes's daughter a secret from everybody (764). Yet Chremes informs Phanium of this himself (Cf. 872—73). How could Phanium keep such a thing a secret from her husband?

10. Even Antipho and Phaedria are not to know that Chremes is Phanium's father (819). But Antipho's wife is allowed to learn this! (See **9**).

11. There is a discrepancy between 873 (Cum eius consuevit olim matre in Lemno clanculum) and 1017—18 (Vinolentus...... mulierculam eam compressit...... neque postilla umquam attigit).

12. What can Antipho mean when he says in 877: "Atque hercle ego quoque illam inaudivi fabulam."?

13. Before his departure to Lemnos Chremes had thoroughly determined how he would provide for Phanium and at the same time keep his secret. (Cf. 567—90). On his return he changes his plan to suit the circumstances, but his changes are greater than is necessary.

14. Nausistrata learns nearly everything about Chremes's moral lapse, but not that she has already met his daughter as Antipho's wife. (Cf. 815).

15. In 765 Chremes enters the house in order to see Phanium. In 783 (according to Fleckeisen and others even after an intervening entr'acte) Geta enters the same house and in spite of the difference in time he is early enough to overhear their interview.

16. In 795 Chremes leaves the house. On the stage Demipho and Nausistrata stand next to each other (792—94). Chremes sees Demipho and accosts him (795—96), but does not notice Nausistrata before 797.

17. Why does Demipho say to Chremes: "At t u intro abi", (819), although he enters the house with him at once?

18. There is no plausible reason for Antipho's entrance in 820.

About the first 7 of the objections enumerated we need not say

much. Antipho's and Phaedria's spontaneous entrance at the beginning of the 2nd act (**1**) is in keeping with Greek tradition. Inner turmoil drives man to find distraction outside as happens to Sophrona in the present play (728). That Apollodorus makes well-considered use of this traditional motivation is also evident from the way in which he has the action begin in the opening lines of the 2nd act of the *Hekyra* (verses 198 ff.).

The peculiarity mentioned under **3** I have treated and explained above [1]. It is a slight sin, which supports the virtue of the composition; Fleckeisen's division of the acts makes the sin useless and causes the virtue to disappear.

What has been mentioned under **2**, **6** and **7** belongs together. The peculiarity pointed out justifies the conclusion that Apollodorus preferred brief clarity [2] to absolute naturalness and that he was unable to combine the two. It is true that it is not natural for Demipho to have a detailed knowledge of everything, but it is practical. I do not think that Terence deviated from his model here, except in trifles; for example, he could not but have Demipho speak of Chremes's d a u g h t e r in 568, so as to inform his audience; Apollodorus could avoid this word, because h i s audience knew that Chremes had a daughter.

Finally we turn to points **5** and **4**. We have seen above [3] that in the Greek play Geta went to look for his young master at 463, and returned with him after an entr'acte. Consequently a motivation of Antipho's entrance was unnecessary there, and Geta's action was motivated by his thought that Demipho would stay away a long time. It follows that verses 460—62 are not an innovation introduced by Terence, which is further corroborated by Donatus's note to verse 482 [4]. As to Demipho's frankness (**4**),—it is not quite natural, but not absurd either. The intention of the poet is clear: he could not do without Antipho at the complication which arose from Phaedria's love-affair [5].

[1]) See pp. 58, 59—60.

[2]) Cf. Kunst, *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Kom.* p. 151.

[3]) See pp. 61 f.

[4]) "Huc salvum nunc patruum Geta" non optat salvum patruum venire secundum A p o l l o d o r u m, e.q.s.

[5]) See p. 62.

Therefore it is my opinion that, apart from the slight changes mentioned, Terence is in conformity with his model at the first 7 points. However, the other unevennesses, inconsistencies, incomprehensibilities or whatever one may wish to call them, are to be ascribed to him, if I am not mistaken, and they display radical changes. They may be divided into 2 groups. For **15**, **16**, **17** and **18** bear especially on the action, the others (**8**—**14**) particularly on the *donnée* of the comedy and its treatment. It goes without saying that there is a connection between the two groups; in what respect they are connected will appear in due course. Therefore it is preferable to treat each of the groups separately first.

It is remarkable that the four points where there is a hitch in the a c t i o n as pointed out in **15**—**18**, all occur within those 100 verses which, as we have suggested before [1]), represent Apollodorus's 4th act in Terence's play. This enhances the probability that Terence has made cuts in the "act of recognition". For now not only the number of verses, which is abnormally small for a whole act, but also the hitch in the action suggests abridgment. It is absurd as I have said, that Chremes, whose coming out of the house is noticed by Nausistrata in 795 [2]), addresses Demipho but simply does not see his wife (**16**). The action in this instance would only be acceptable if Nausistrata did not stand by the side or in the neighbourhood of Demipho on the stage, but left her house at verse 797 or just before it. However, we see her on the stage with Demipho in the scene beginning at verse 784 and no doubt this was also the course of events in the Greek play. If we put these two requirements together—Nausistrata was outside her house after 784, she left her house at 797—we cannot but conclude that, for a reason we do not know as yet, she had re-entered for a while, Demipho remaining on the stage and debating with himself. Consequently Terence has added those words with which Chremes's coming outside was indicated by Nausistrata (795b), and has cut out a passage at the same point.

Similarly there can be no doubt but that he has also left out something after verse 819 (**17**). Chremes enters Demipho's house at the

[1]) See pp. 65—66.

[2]) 795 b Sed meum virum ex te exire video.

request of the latter: "At tu intro abi". This is not the same as "Go in" or: "After you". The wording suggests a contrast in word or action; there is, however, no such contrast. For without saying anything else Demipho enters the house at the same time with Chremes. Consequently Terence has thoughtlessly given an accurate translation of the first part of the contrast and deleted the second part. The latter cannot but have run: "I will come presently". In this way Demipho got another opportunity here to go in for solitary deliberation, and Terence has expunged this soliloquy.

The 3rd hitch (**18**) is more complicated. I have said that there is no plausible reason for Antipho's entrance in 820. For indeed it is mere fiction to imagine that at this moment his chance of keeping Phanium [1]) has increased, and that it would be useful to speak to his father [2]). In 699—711 Geta has clearly told him: he has to wait patiently, and then his business will finally be all right. And meanwhile he has not learned anything to counteract this admonition. If Antipho's return is not based on his own interest, it must be based on the interest of somebody else. That other person can only have been Phaedria. This follows firstly from the nature of the *donnée,* secondly from the cousins' tacit agreement of mutual assistance, to which Terence alludes in verses 266—69 [3]), but to which Antipho pays little heed in Terence's play; thirdly from the thoughts which he utters on entering the stage; he points out Phaedria's happiness in contrast to his own irretrievable condition [4]);

[1]) Verses 826 f.
Neque me domum nunc reciperem, ni mi esset spes ostenta
Huiusce habendae.

[2]) Verses 827 f. sed ubi nam Getam invenire possim,
Ut rogem, quod tempus conveniundi patris me capere suadeat?
It is characteristic that Fleckeisen followed by Dziatzko, deletes verse 828. Kauer-Lindsay: possim, ut Rogem.

[3]) Verses 266 ff.
Dem. Hic in noxiast, ille ad dicendam causam adest:
Quom illest, hic praestost: tradunt operas mutuas.
Get. Probe horum facta inprudens depinxit senex.
Dem. Nam ni haec ita essent, cum illo haud stares, Phaedria.

[4]) Verses 824 f. Ego nullo possum remedio me evolvere ex his turbis,
Quin, si hoc celetur, in metu, sin patefit, in probro sim.
In the following verses Terence counteracts the contrast by adding: Neque me domum nunc reciperem, ni mi esset spes ostenta huiusce habendae.

fourthly from the fact that he has just left Phaedria [1]. It may be objected that in the Greek play, as well as in Terence's, it was necessary for Antipho to be present when Geta made his disclosures in 841 ff., so that Apollodorus was compelled to direct him back to the stage and could not but make shift with a false motive. But this objection is met by another difficulty. It is certainly true that Antipho and Phormio together had to listen to Geta. But why do they not enter the stage together? In 712 Antipho turned to the left, towards Dorio's house, for Phaedria is there, and Antipho had to go to him [2]. Phormio has received the 30 *minae* in the market [3], has taken that money to Dorio, has taken the girl with him [4] and installed her with Phaedria in his own home [5]. In his own home, that is to say to the left of the stage. And nevertheless we see that Antipho and Phormio enter the stage separately, 10 verses after one another, and either coming from the left, the one with a false motive, the other with a sound motive [6]. This must be the result of change and shuffling. For if Antipho had been present when Pamphila was bought and had accompanied her with Phaedria and Phormio to Phormio's house, he ought ultimately to enter the stage at the same time as and together with Phormio [7]. But if he had not been present when Pamphila was bought and if he had merely delivered the message which Geta had given him for Phaedria in 712, then he ought not to appear a bare 10 verses previous to Phormio, but at least two scenes. Was Antipho present at the purchase and the conveyance of Pamphila? No, for he makes

[1]) Cf. verse 712.

[2]) Cf. verse 712. Get. abi, dic esse argentum Phaedriae.
verse 847. Get. Ad lenonem hinc ire pergam: ibi nunc sunt.

[3]) Verse 598 f. Get. hominem ad forum
Iussi opperiri: eo me esse adducturum senem.

[4]) Verse 829. Phorm. Argentum accepi, tradidi lenoni: abduxi mulierem.

[5]) Verse 830. Phorm. Curavi propria ut Phaedria poteretur: nam emissast manu.
Verse 837. Phorm. Nam potaturus est apud me.

Sloman (*Phormio* 1899[2]) wrongly makes the following note at verse 829: "Phormio comes on from the Forum."

[6]) Cf. verse 831. Nunc una mihi res etiam restat quae est conficiunda, etc.

[7]) It cannot be alleged that Antipho was obliged to avoid being seen in the street in Phormio's company. The distance is short, and the stage itself is a street.

inquiries from Phormio as to what Phaedria is going to do now [1]). There is nothing in their interview to indicate that they had met just before. It follows that Antipho had left Dorio when Phormio arrived. When did Phormio come to the *leno*? This may fairly accurately be calculated at the hand of Terence's text if it is borne in mind that the scene on the stage where Chremes recognizes Sophrona covers a double action enacted behind the scenes. This double action consisted of two divergent movements, one somewhat shorter than the other, both starting from the market, the first ending on the stage, the second at Dorio's house. Phormio is paid in the market by Demipho and Geta [2]). They return straight home, and Phormio goes to the *leno* by a round-about way. We see the master with his slave on the stage again in the short scene of verses 766 to 783. It may therefore be determined that Phormio reaches the *leno* towards the time when the scene ends. And thus we arrive at the final conclusion that in Apollodorus's play Antipho has not re-entered later than immediately after 783; so that it appears that Terence has put his entry some 40 verses later and in doing so has disposed of the plausible reason for his appearance, as I pointed out above [3]).

What that reason was is not yet under discussion. But it is clear that the whole change in the action, just as the two other changes (**16** and **17**), is connected with a changed treatment of the *donnée* and with an abridgment of the old theme. However, before I try to reconstruct the entire subject into its original state it is necessary to treat the other inconsistencies (**8—14**); number **15** will come in for discussion of its own accord.

I pointed out above that before starting for Lemnos Chremes had very thoroughly prepared his plan (**13**). He was going to take Phanium with him to Athens—that is to say Phanium alone, without

[1]) Verse 833.

[2]) See verses 598—99, 713 ff.

[3]) Of course Antipho might have returned even earlier, for he had already left in 712; the last possibility is immediately after 783. But Apollodorus has certainly not made him enter the stage before he needed him. Why he needed him will appear later. During the scenes 784—819 he had to stow him away in the *angiportum* (see verse 891; p. 64 n. 3, p. 87 n. 3); Terence could evade this by his transposition.

her housemates—and there she was to be married to Antipho. (Cf. verses 567 ff.). Only Demipho was to share his knowledge that she was his daughter. Should Nausistrata happen to inquire who that wife of her nephew's really was, the reply was to be that she was a daughter of one of Demipho's friends. (Cf. verses 811—12).

How Chremes wished to carry out the details of the plan, how, for example, he was going to explain to Phanium that the Stilpo, who fetched her from Lemnos, was called Chremes in Athens, is of no importance, as the plan was not carried out in this form. Therefore the only question is whether under the changed circumstances Chremes was still able to save the carefully prepared appearances. In order to determine this we have in the first place to ascertain how much Sophrona knew and how much Phanium knew.

Sophrona knew "Stilpo", and knew that he was Phanium's father; she did not know that his real name was Chremes, nor where he lived in Athens. Did she know on arriving at Athens that Stilpo had a wife there? This is quite incredible, I think. For why should that Stilpo-Chremes have told Phanium's mother that he was committing bigamy? This did not dawn on Sophrona before the "recognition" (verses 728 ff.), because Stilpo was then compelled to give the reason for his false name [1]). But that was the only thing she learned on the top of what she knew. Chremes did not tell her his real name, nor that Demipho was his brother, any more than where he lived. For if he had told her where he lived, she would have known at once that he was Demipho's brother, that his name was Chremes and that Nausistrata was his wife. This is what Terence has overlooked when, probably in order to make a Greek joke more humorous, he made Chremes say in 744: "*Conclusam hic habeo uxorem saevam*". The Greek Chremes must have disguised his fear of his own front-door by means of the protest: "They have got a bad dog here" [2]). For: "I have a bad wife behind this door" means: "I live here"; and this again meant to Sophrona: "That Stilpo is Demipho's brother and he

[1]) Verse 744 ff. Verum istoc me nomine
Eo perperam olim dixi, ne vos forte inprudentes foris
Effutiretis atque id porro aliqua uxor mea rescisceret.

[2]) E.g. οἰκουρός ἐστιν ἐνθαδὶ χαλεπὴ κύων. The Greek Chremes thought of his wife and spoke of a dog, the Latin Chremes thinks of a dog and speaks of his wife.

is called Chremes". The end of Terence's scene also proves that this thought had never occurred to Sophrona. For if she had understood that Demipho was "Stilpo's" brother, she would not have said: "The young man's father has returned home, he is said to be very angry because of the marriage" [1]. On that account Chremes demands two promises from her and no more: that she shall not call him "Stilpo" [2] and that she shall not appear to know that the pseudo-Stilpo is Phanium's father [3]. So all that Sophrona knew is this: his name is not Stilpo, he is married, he is Phanium's father.

And what did Phanium know? Even less than Sophrona. She only knew Stilpo by name, as a person not to be found, from whom assistance had been expected in Athens. For there is not a trace of proof in Terence's play that every time when Chremes went to Lemnos he called at the house where Phanium lived with her mother in his capacity of husband and father. Nausistrata's interrogative deduction in verses 1012—1013:

> Haecine erant itiones crebrae et mansiones diutinae
> Lemni? haecine erat ea quae nostros minuit fructus vilitas? [4]

are the understandable but exaggerated suspicions of a jealous woman. Demipho restores his brother's offence to its real proportions by means of this reply:

> Vinolentus fere abhinc annos quindecim mulierculam
> Eam compressit, unde haec natast: neque postilla umquam attigit [5].

It is impossible, I think, that Demipho should be telling a lie here. What advantage could it be to his brother, now that everything has come to light, so that Nausistrata is able to prove the truth. The previous history, too, proves that Chremes had soon broken the tie that bound him to Lemnos, and only continued the relation spasmodically. "*Paupertas*" and "*egestas*" is the burden of all that we learn

[1]) Verses 762—63. — Chremes lightly answers: *Nil periclist.* He takes care that he does not make her any the wiser.

[2]) Verse 742.

[3]) Verses 764—65.

[4]) Verses 1012—13.

[5]) Verses 1017—18. See **11.**

about the circumstances of his Lemnian family [1]. And Chremes speaks candidly about his *„negligentia"* [2]. The question whether Phanium knew more than I said above becomes a question of human nature generally: "Is a woman who has experienced what Phanium's mother has experienced, falling the victim of indecent assault, married to her assailant, and next deserted by him, likely to tell her daughter who is scarcely 14 years old [3] that her father is still alive, but does not concern himself about them, and respectfully to inform her of his dear name?" This, I think, was just as improbable 2200 years ago as it would be now. But it might be concluded from Chremes's words in verses 569—72 [4] that an arrangement about Phanium's marriage must have been made shortly before, between himself and the mother. It is indeed possible that Terence tries to suggest such a thing. The conclusion is, however, contradictory to Apollodorus's substruction. This appears from Sophrona's attitude in verses 730—31, 733, 751—53. She does not apologize for having married Phanium off without considering existing plans, but exclusively for having accepted for her a marriage on such an uncertain basis. That she does not know anything about the intended marriage is also proved by a passage in the exposition [5].

From all this it is perfectly clear, I think, that, having recognized Sophrona and drawn her out, Chremes could try to carry out his old plan slightly altered. It was still possible for him to marry off his Phanium to Antipho as somebody else's daughter without anybody knowing, except Demipho, that she was his own daughter. That this was really his intention in the Greek play is clear from verse 819. For there he says emphatically to Demipho that even the sons are not to know. Thence again it follows that he did certainly not intend to say to Phanium what Geta heard him say in Terence's play in the overheard interview of verses 869 ff.: "I am your

[1] Verses 94, 733.
[2] Verse 571.
[3] Verse 1017.
[4] 569 ff. Postquam videt me eius mater esse hic diutius,
Simul autem non manebat aetas virginis
Meam neglegentiam: ipsam cum omni familia
Ad me profectam esse aibant.
[5] Verses 112—16.

father."[1]) We may safely assume that Chremes has not spoken these words in Apollodorus's play. But, however prudent he might be, there was one danger and he knew it. Its name was Sophrona. If she were to perceive that pseudo-Stilpo was nobody else but Chremes, Antipho's uncle, and Nausistrata's husband, his secret would no longer be safe, in spite of her promise to be silent. Consequently she had to pack up ilico and leave the house and go back to Lemnos. Once she had left [2]), it would be possible for him to tell Phanium the so-called truth in that form which was required by the new situation, thus: "That Stilpo, about whom she had probably heard now and then, was her father. But Stilpo was dead. He, Chremes, was a friend and relative of that deceased Stilpo, and besides he was Demipho's brother. His brother Demipho was sure to bestow his blessing on the marriage between his son and Phanium after hearing about the relationship."

On the ground of this reconstruction, which is the logical result of the previous history, the following conclusions must be drawn with regard to the account Geta gives of his findings in Demipho's house (verses 861 ff.): Firstly, „*illis*" (i.e. both Phanium and Sophrona) in verse 866 [3]) is a change made by Terence. There was nothing further that Chremes had to tell Sophrona; what he disclosed to Phanium was not meant for Sophrona; at the moment when Chremes was talking to Phanium she had already left the house. Secondly, this interview did not take place immediately after verse 765, as I will explain presently. Thirdly, the verses 872—873 are an innovation by Terence. The former was discussed above, the latter previously [4]). I then pointed out that the words "*cum eius consuevit olim matre in Lemno clanculum*" (873) clash with Demipho's explicit declaration of 1017—18. It may be added that they clash with the appellation given to the deceased Lemnian woman, viz. "uxor" [5]), an appellation which was the basis of Phanium's civic

[1]) Geta repeats it to Antipho with his own words (verse 872): Patruos tuos est pater inventus Phanio uxori tuae.

[2]) I.e. n o t immediately after verse 765. See **15**.

[3]) Verse 866. Eumque (i.e. Chremetem) nunc esse intus cum i l l i s.

[4]) See p. 67, **11** and cf. p. 74.

[5]) Verses 940—41, 1004—1005. Cf. 114—15: illam civem esse Atticam bonam bonis prognatam.

rights and consequently of the theme of this comedy. There is no doubt but that Chremes had really married Phanium's mother; we know now that in the Greek play he said to Phanium: "Your father was a certain Stilpo, I knew him very well, he was my friend and relative." And thence it follows that Geta, having overheard that interview, did not communicate to Phormio and Antipho what he is made to say in Terence's play (872), but the following staggering report: "Stilpo was really Phanium's father and Stilpo was really a relation of Chremes's!" That is exactly the same "lie" which Phormio had told the judges. It is easy to understand that Phormio could not believe this himself at the first moment. His exclamation: "*Somnium: utin haec ignoraret suom patrem?*" [1]), which lacks sense in Terence's play—for it is by no means surprising that a girl should not know anything about her father if he "had had a secret association with her mother"—appears to be authentic and fits in excellently in the reconstruction. But this is only a small advantage. It is more important that we are now able to fully interpret Antipho's obscure words of verse 877, and give a new support to the thesis that in the Greek play he re-entered the stage immediately after 783—not as late as 820—and that he entered on account of a plausible reason [2]). At the same time it will become clear what exactly was cut by Terence after verse 795a, that is before Chremes's entrance and his interview with Demipho [3]). In order to prove my theory I shall start from the enigmatical verse 877.

When Geta has finished his recital of what he had overheard in the house, Antipho says (877): "*Atque hercle ego quoque illam inaudivi fabulam*". W h a t gossip does he mean? Surely he cannot have learnt—and that from Phanium and Sophrona, as is asserted by some commentators [4])—that Chremes is Phanium's father. If they really knew or suspected that, the whole play would have no *raison d'être*. And w h e n had he heard "that gossip"? This question, too, is left unanswered by Terence's play. The answer to both questions, however, is obvious as soon as we know that in the Greek play that gossip was: "Stilpo is really Phanium's father",

1) Verse 874.
2) See pp. 70 ff. 3) See p. 69.
4) E.g. Hoekstra, *Phormio*, 1894.

and that Antipho's return from Dorio's house came immediately after verse 783 in the Greek play. Antipho had heard the story to which he refers in verse 877 shortly after verse 783, and he had overheard it from Sophrona's mouth. For Sophrona, who had entered Demipho's house with Chremes at verse 765, was ordered to pack up and leave the house. In the mean time Demipho and Geta filled the stage; Demipho went to see Nausistrata (777), while Geta entered Demipho's house (783) in order to prepare Phanium for Nausistrata's visit. Just when he had entered the house, Apollodorus's Antipho came stealing along carefully from the left and, only a few paces from the entrance-door, spoke the words which Terence has preserved in verses 820—825. Thereupon Sophrona came out of the house on the left and, without seeing Antipho, she burst into lamentations about that Stilpo, who refused to be Stilpo, but was Phanium's father, and had rewarded her for her faithful services by showing her the door. Thus it becomes easy to understand that Geta, who does not enter the house before 783 in order to give Phanium the information required, is nevertheless not too late for the interview with Chremes to be overheard by him [1]; moreover it is now possible to explain why in Geta's interview with Phormio and Antipho the latter said that he had already heard the *fabula* about Phanium's father. In Terence's play Antipho's remark of 877 is entirely ignored, in Apollodorus's play it was meant to be a factor in the discovery of Chremes's secret, which had not yet been discovered at that stage. And therefore Antipho related at this point of the Greek play what his *fabula* implied: "A Stilpo, who was not Stilpo, but who was yet Phanium's father, had shown Sophrona the door with a high hand." Who was that obscure figure? To this question Geta could give the answer, for he was in the house at the moment when Sophrona left it. At that moment no stranger of authority was to be seen in Demipho's house, but in the women's apartment uncle Chremes was talking to Phanium. Consequently that mysterious Stilpo was Chremes and Chremes was Stilpo. This was the joyful and surprising discovery which the three made in beautiful co-operation, on the stage, before the eyes of

[1]) Strictly speaking the interview must have been finished in Terence's play when Geta entered the house. See **15.**

Apollodorus's audience. Terence was compelled to cut that passage. He had no Sophrona who had been expelled, consequently he had not a real "*fabula*" either, any more than an Antipho having really heard the fable. Hence in Terence's *Phormio* that radical discovery of Chremes's secret, in the room, and to its full extent; hence Chremes's confession to Phanium, contrary to his preconceived plan and in spite of all his precautions, opposed to his character and against the requirements of the comic εἰκός.

Sophrona's rôle and that of Antipho after 783 now demand our attention anew. For, although the calculation given above shows clearly that the two of them, first the young man and shortly afterwards the *Nutrix* entered the stage at this point of the Greek play, it must also be possible to say where she went after her exit, and what good ground there has been at this point for Antipho's entry, who appears without a plausible reason in verse 820 of Terence's play.

The answer to the first of these two questions is obvious; one only needs to remember that there is a hiatus in Terence's text after 795a. The action at this point shows, as we pointed out previously [1], that in the Greek play Nausistrata came out of her house a second time at 797; evidently she had temporarily gone back to the house for some reason or other. We find this reason here. She took the old *Nutrix* who had been cast out into her house. The comic effect is unmistakable: for fear of discovery Chremes had turned the good Sophrona out of his brother's house and the result of his misplaced suspicion was that she appeared in his own house! But to what she owed that kindness of Nausistrata's and what were the contents of the passages expunged by Terence at this point, will become clearer anon. For it is not possible to reconstruct this part of the *Epidikazomenos* without knowing the real motive of Antipho's entrance. It may be assumed that the knowledge of this motive will also help us to fully reconstruct the theme of the Greek play. This theme has apparently been abridged by Terence, and since the passages which he has deleted belonged to the 4th act of Apollodorus's play, a priori it is probable that he has cut out an *anagnorisis*.

[1]) See p. 69.

As has been pointed out [1], Antipho cannot have gone to the danger zone of his father's house for the sake of his own interests, but only for the benefit of his cousin Phaedria. We hear him say that he would certainly not have come thither, if he had not...... [2]. We see him carefully look round to find out whether Geta is perhaps to be discerned in the neighbourhood, in order to ask him...... [3]. Antipho comes from Dorio's house, where Pamphila, the cither-player, has lived for the last few months and will now be redeemed. The money was being conveyed thither when Antipho left Dorio. His task and intention must therefore have had something to do with Pamphila. Was it his task to plead Phaedria's cause with Chremes? [4] Certainly not. For Phaedria knows better than to ask for his parents' blessing upon that love-affair. And moreover Antipho looks for Geta, who is a slave in Demipho's house. What else can his task have been than taking valuables belonging to Pamphila to his own house for the benefit of Phaedria, where Phanium could safely keep them in the *gynaikonitis,* as if they were her own property?

But, it may be asked, was Pamphila one of those girls who possess valuables carefully hidden in a little box, as we know them from the *Cistellaria* and the *Perikeiromene*? Jachmann has written that in changing the names of the *dramatis personae* of the *Epidikazomenos* Terence erroneously gave the little *citharistria* a name which in the Greek Νέα is only fit for cither-players whose pure, Attic descent was discovered at last [5]. The reasoning may also be inverted: Terence erroneously had her keep the name which she had got from Apollodorus just because her good descent was to be discovered. But was it possible for a girl in the power of a *leno* to be rehabilitated? This question need not disturb us. Antiphila,

1) See p. 70.

2) Cf. verse 826. Neque me domum nunc reciperem, ni... What Terence adds is the new motive invented by himself. Similarly in verses 827—28 quoted hereunder.

3) Cf. verses 827—28. Sed ubi nam Getam invenire possim, ut Rogem...

4) This might perhaps be gathered from Phormio's words to Antipho in 835: "*Te ... rogavit ... causam ut pro se diceres*", but it is clear that Phormio means: "to invent a good excuse for Phaedria's absence".

5) Vide supra, p. 51.

in Menander's *Heauton Timoroumenos,* was in the power of a *meretrix,* and yet she was recognized as the legitimate daughter of Chremes and Sostrata. In Menander's *Kolax* Pheidias's lady-love was in the power of a πορνοβοσκός, but everything tends to show that ultimately her Attic descent was discovered [1]. If we consider what Terence tells us about Pamphila in the *Phormio,* we shall find that there is no reason to doubt her virginity. It is true that Geta calls her a "*citharistria*" [2], but she is not yet hired out to grace festivals; she had not yet begun to practise her profession. Pamphila is only a school-child, she has not seen more of life than the road to the school of music and back [3], a *puellula*—this is Geta's own word [4]—at whom Phaedria has stared his eyes out for months, while Dorio has her carefully watched, until the young man shall have borrowed the money, which the *leno* demands for her [5]. That this *citharistria* possessed civic rights is not less certain, I think, than that the *psaltria* of the *Adelphi,* who has neither name nor honour in Terence's play, was recognized in Menander's Ἀδελφοί as the daughter of Demea and Sostrata [6]. These two cither-players are actually each other's replica, and Apollodorus, just like Menander, had an opportunity, in his monologue of the god, of reassuring his audience beforehand regarding the chastity of this Pamphila. Of course the god has also said whose daughter Pamphila was. It is not difficult for us, having the whole play before us, to point out the father. Of the two persons coming in for consideration, Demipho and Chremes, we unhesitatingly choose the former. He stands out, as it were, as the father. For Terence has kept a detail which, together with Donatus's note on it, corroborates the surmise about Demipho and Pamphila expressed just now, in every respect. When Geta makes the fictitious proposal to the two

[1]) See W. E. J. Kuiper, *De Menandri Adulatore,* Mnemos. LVIII pp. 165 ff. Adelphasium and Anterastylis of Plautus's *Poenulus* (Menander's(?) Καρχηδόνιος), too, are in the power of a *leno,* and are recognized by Hanno as his daughters. Similarly Palaestra in Plautus's *Rudens* is the property of a *leno.*

[2]) Verse 82.

[3]) Verses 85—86.

[4]) Verse 81.

[5]) Verses 80—90, 520, 523 ff., 513.

[6]) See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.* pp. 138, 143, 144, 149.

old men that Phormio will take Phanium as his wife [1]), and gives an account of his invented interview with the sycophant, he says that the latter had at first demanded a full talent for his compliance [2]). Demipho bursts out: Immo malum hercle: ut nil pudet! And Geta backs him up with the words [3]):

> Quod dixi ei adeo: "quaeso, quid si filiam
> Suam unicam locaret? parvi re tulit
> Non suscepisse: inventast quae dotem petat."

Donatus gives the following note on this: in Graeca fabula senex hoc dicit: "quid interest me non suscepisse filiam, si modo dos dabitur alienae?" What then is the difference between the original and the imitation? It is that the abandoning of a child, which in Terence's play gives the impression of fiction—for Geta lies from A to Z, so that we are inclined to assume that the repartee, too, with which he says he has given Phormio a taking down, is based on an invention of his—is related as bare and actual reality in Apollodorus's play. It cannot be decided whether Demipho has publicly and cynically confessed here that he had abandoned a little daughter or whether he had reminded the audience of it by means of an 'aside', although we know that Apollodorus can indeed avail himself gracefully of 'asides' [4]). But there cannot be any doubt regarding the fact that his Demipho had abandoned a daughter, or regarding the fact that at the time of the play she must have been grown-up. Nor can it be doubted, I think, that she had a part in the play. Her age not only follows from Demipho's meditation concerning her dowry, but also from his own age and circumstances. Since he is a *senex* and a widower, he cannot be the father of young children. Consequently his daughter must have been only a few years younger than Antipho. Terence himself shows by his above-

1) Verses 608 ff.

2) Verses 642 ff.

> Chrem. Cedo quid postulat?
> Get. Quid? nimium; quantum libuit. Chrem. Dic. Get. Si quis daret
> Talentum magnum.

3) Verses 645 ff.

4) See e.g. *Phormio* 310, 757 ff., *Hecyra* 466—67, 628, 633, 634, 639, 648—49, 653, 670—71, 701—705.

mentioned change that she had a part in the Greek play. For why should he have represented the fact of abandonment as something fictitious, if there were no connection between that fact and a portion of the story, which he had deleted? Demipho's character does not clash with the action which he confesses. What is said about him as well as what he does and says clearly shows that Apollodorus wished to characterize him as a φιλάργυρος [1]). But he is not a cruel, unreasonable miser, who sacrifices everything for the loaves and fishes. That he is a "*lenis pater*" could only be believed if another asserted it, not himself [2]); nor can it be asserted that Antipho's conduct and character testify to his educator's gentleness. But nevertheless Demipho does not give an impression of a thoroughly hard-hearted and callous man. Consequently besides his economy there must have been another reason why he had abandoned his little daughter, a reason, that is, which did not originate from his character, but from circumstances, i.e. a reason of a temporary nature [3]). For the poet had not only to explain why Demipho abandoned his child when it was born, but also why he did not flatly refuse to acknowledge and accept it when it was grown-up.

It is not difficult to discover the second reason (the one which would no longer be valid under changed circumstances). I alluded to it when I said that Demipho is a widower. Indeed, there is no mistress of the house, and this does not mean that she does not occur among the *dramatis personae* by mere chance, but she is really absent, for reasons inherent in the plot. Her absence was necessary in the given situation. For it would have been impossible for Antipho to have installed his young wife in his father's house, and for the action to take the course prescribed by the poet if there had been a mother, a mistress of the house. But it would have been

[1]) Cf. verses 69—70, 84, 120—21, 298, 302—3, 358, 663—64, 669, 769, 897—99, 955.

[2]) Verse 262.

[3]) Hoekstra's note (*Phormio* 646): "Demipho had his only daughter abandoned at the time, as happened rather frequently in Athens, so as to save a dowry", is not corroborated by the practice of life nor by the practice of the stage. Cf. *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, p. 74; H. Bolkestein, *The expos. of children at Athens* (Class. Phil. XVIII, 3).

a wonder if the poet had not at the same time utilized the mother's death—required by the plot—in the structure of the previous history.

Readers of Menander will remember how in the scene of recognition of the *Perikeiromene* Pataikos justifies himself for having abandoned his newly-born twin: unexpected and total poverty together with the mother's death in childbed had driven him to it [1]. There is, I think, reason to assume that, apart from the many things he derived from Menander, Apollodorus also applied this motif to the previous history after changing it to suit his needs. Accordingly his Demipho spoke from bitter experience when at his first entry he soliloquized on the vicissitudes of fate [2]. And if his wife had died shortly after the birth of the girl, the audience would have understood about the close-fisted Demipho that he abandoned the child. This would have been easy to understand, but not to defend, unless he paid the debt of poetic justice afterwards. He had to find the girl again, acknowledge her as his daughter, and provide her dowry. This was the way in which miserly fathers were cured of their meanness on the Attic stage. That Pamphila was that daughter, that she was to be married to Phaedria, Demipho's nephew, just as Phaedria's bosom-friend Antipho had married the daughter of uncle Chremes, Demipho's brother,—any one who can doubt that would be able to deny the equilibrium of equilibrium itself.

We can now try to reconstruct the recognition cut out by Terence, at the hand of the *donnée* restored. The cuts at verse 783 and verse 795, which we pointed out above, undoubtedly belonged to the *anagnorisis* of Pamphila. But the reconstruction of scenes and passages deleted is a matter of conjecture. It is possible to point out that something is lacking and of what nature the missing part is with greater certainty than to point out its size and form with any degree of accuracy. Yef I will not abstain from this attempt, because in my opinion the total reconstruction proves the sum of the whole argument. For only if it is shown how a theme which is absent in

[1]) *Perikeir.* verses 370 ff.

[2]) Verses 241—46; see especially 243—44:
Pericla, damna peregre rediens semper secum cogitet
Aut fili peccatum aut u x o r i s m o r t e m aut morbum filiae.

the adaptator's work may have been elaborated by the original poet, only then it is proved that the theme itself was possible in the model. As long as we have not proved that it was possible, we have no right to say that it really existed.

The *anagnorisis* of Pamphila must have taken place in the 4th act of Apollodorus's play. This is suggested by the number of verses which Terence has kept of this act according to our calculations [1]), and it is corroborated by the hitches in his action pointed out and discussed above under **15**, **16**, **17** and **18** [2]). But it is improbable that in the 4th act a full identification of Demipho's abandoned daughter was reached. For there was no possibility to make her and even Phaedria enter the stage for the identification so early in the play. It follows at once that in the *anagnorisis* proper neither Pamphila nor Phaedria played a rôle. This goes without saying as far as Pamphila is concerned. The writers of the Greek **Νέα** were more or less reluctant to have girls of good descent play an active part. But even if Apollodorus had not felt this reluctance or had conquered it, it would have been impossible for him to put Pamphila into contact with her father, because her entry would have been perfectly unwarranted. There was no reason for her to be on the stage. Neither is it to be imagined that Apollodorus had her lover Phaedria appear so as to make him bring about the *anagnorisis* while he was pleading his love and was ignorant of her descent [3]). For Phaedria had no reason for pleading as long as his love was a secret from his father. And it had of needs to remain a secret until it had become clear to Chremes and Demipho what Phormio had used the sum of 30 *minae* for. From this it follows that, i f Phaedria appeared, he could not appear before the end of the recognition of Phanium, and before Demipho and Chremes had claimed back the 30 *minae* from Phormio. And this undoubtedly did not happen before V, after verse 894. From these considerations alone it is clear, I think, that Phaedria did not enter the stage in the 4th act of the

[1]) See p. 66.

[2]) Pages 67, 69 ff.

[3]) This happened in the *Andria* and probably also in Menander's *Adelphoi*. (*See Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.*, p. 137). There, however, Pamphilus and Ctesipho were compelled to plead for their love, which had already been discovered before or in the 4th act.

Epidikazomenos; it is corroborated by the fact that no trace of his entry is to be discovered in that part of Terence's *Phormio* which corresponds to that act. It may be concluded that for Pamphila's *anagnorisis* Apollodorus did not avail himself of the girl herself or of her lover, but of the inanimate means of recognition.

It is not impossible, I think, to reconstruct the action. For we know who and what was necessary for it, what was discovered and when. The essentials were Demipho, Pamphila's valuables—no doubt put away in a box—and some one who, inadvertently of course, smuggled the box into Demipho's hands. He had to recognize the valuables as his former property, and that recognition occurred somewhere in the 4th act, i.e. between verse 727 and verse 827. In this part of the play Demipho is on the stage from 766—777, and next from 784—819. We have already seen that Terence has made cuts in this part of the play after 783, at 795 and after 819, and have pointed out that after 783 Antipho and next Sophrona entered the stage, and that Nausistrata took Sophrona into her house before 797 [1]. Antipho had come from Dorio's house, from Phaedria and Pamphila, to whom he had gone in 712. We already made the supposition that he carried Pamphila's valuables, in order to have them safely stored away in Phanium's room. It is possible and legitimate to connect the whole action with the *anagnorisis.* Therein chance had to render its useful services; for Antipho did not dare to look his father in the face and moreover he ought not to notice anything about Phanium's recognition for the moment.

In Menander's *Synaristosai* and in his *Andria* Chance bore a hand, because what one person had the misfortune to lose, another person had the good fortune to find [2]. In these comedies, however, the loser immediately came to look for what he had lost, before the finder's eyes, so that the origin of the means of recognition could be discovered and the *anagnorisis* become complete. This procedure was impossible in the *Epidikazomenos,* because of Antipho's character and rôle, as pointed out above. Therefore I think it certain that Apollodorus availed himself of the character of Sophrona in

[1] See pp. 70—72, 76 f., 79.

[2] See *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.* pp. 197—98 (*Cistellaria,* verses 637—773), pp. 113—16 (*Andria*).

order to make Pamphila's valuables pass from Antipho's hands into Demipho's by the intermediary of her person.

We said previously that when after 783 Antipho coming from the left stole on to the stage, he looked for Geta, in order to have him take the valuable box to Phanium. At that moment Sophrona came out of Demipho's house in a pitiable condition, and turning to the right [1]) entered the stage, bewailing her fate and complaining of Stilpo, who did not wish to be called Stilpo and had dismissed her from the house. This scene may now be completed in view of the situation in the following way. Antipho followed her and alarmed by her lamentations asked for an explanation, which she refused. At the same moment he saw Demipho coming out of Chremes's house [2]). He pressed the box into Sophrona's hands telling her to take it to Phanium, and slipped away into the *angiportum* [3]), in front of which he stood.

Now it should be borne in mind that the conversation between Demipho and Nausistrata (verses 784—795a) was carried on to the right of the stage, before Chremes's door. For Nausistrata is not overpleased with the task which Demipho demands her to fulfil [4]); she is rather inclined to tell him what she thinks of Chremes, and what kind of woman she is, than to acquit herself forthwith of the task, of which indeed Demipho has to remind her a few times with kindly persuasion [5]). So it is easy to understand that at first they did not catch sight of Sophrona, who had stopped halfway across the stage, dumbfounded by Antipho's disappearance and hesitating as to whether she should go back or go on. Have we to assume, however, that just as the speakers did not notice Sophrona, neither did she see them, and did not hear what they were saying, or even though she saw them could not hear them? The situation certainly did not tend that way. Sophrona must have overheard their interview, but without understanding its meaning. It is remarkable that this also appears from Terence's text. For in

[1]) I.e. to the spectators' right.
[2]) Verse 784.
[3]) That the *angiportum* is utilized in this play appears from verse 891.
[4]) Cf. verses 814—15.
[5]) Verses 784—85, 786, 793—94.

the whole dialogue of Demipho and Nausistrata (verses 784—95) there is not a word from which Sophrona might have concluded what those two people, her female neighbour and an elderly male stranger, really wanted [1]).

At verse 795 (Faciam ut iubes) the formation of the *dramatis personae* was changed. Nausistrata and Demipho started and consequently met Sophrona, whose pitiable condition attracted their attention, as was only natural. Nausistrata's questions—she knew Phanium's *nutrix,* as is evident from verse 815—could wrest from her nothing but this one thing that she had been expelled from Antipho's house by a stranger. Maybe she described the stranger when Demipho asked her to do so. But it is certain that he must soon have noticed the little box she carried; about that she could declare that Antipho had given it to her for Phanium; Antipho himself had suddenly disappeared. What was to be done with the poor woman? Would Demipho send her back again to his house? There was no reason why he should do that. It would only enhance confusion. And moreover, she dared not go back and she would have to depart presently, as everybody present thought. What was more evident than that Demipho should offer to deliver the little box to the young woman and that Nausistrata should take the *Nutrix* into her house out of pity or curiosity or both?

The action of verses 795b—97 is perfectly elucidated by Nausistrata's short absence, as I pointed out previously [2]). It should be

[1]) This is additional proof that in the Greek play Sophrona was present at this interview as a silent witness. The words "divorce" and "marriage" are painstakingly avoided, the names of Antipho, Phormio and Phanium are not mentioned. Phanium is not even referred to as "a Lemnian woman" or "wife", but only as "she" and "the young woman". It does not appear what is Demipho's name, nor that he is Nausistrata's brother-in-law. In the situation as it occurs in Terence's play that circumspicion is unnecessary and incomprehensible. But Sophrona knew, after what pseudo-Stilpo had assured her (verse 763) that Demipho was likely to attach his *fiat* to the marriage. If she had understood what was going on, and that it was Demipho who was talking to Nausistrata, she could not possibly have been silent about the expected *fiat* in her interview with these two people, which followed after verse 795a. Therefore Apollodorus had them speak a kind of secret language in 784—795.

[2]) Pages 69, 79.

imagined that Demipho walking slowly in the direction of his house recited some verses to himself (before 795b), but was disturbed by Chremes coming out of the house before his brother had time to inspect the contents of the little box carefully while standing at the door. Chremes came out of Demipho's house immediately after the moment that Nausistrata left her house again at the other end of the stage. What follows in Terence's play (verses 795—819) is unchanged, in my opinion. But at the end of this scene a short passage is missing, as appears from the explicit *"at tu abi intro"* [1]. Demipho sent Chremes into the house in order to find, while he was alone on the stage, that his own valuables had returned to him. Then, for the first time since his return, he entered his house, where he was to learn from Phanium that she had nothing to do with the jewels. The 4th act was finished and Pamphila's *anagnorisis* completed for the moment. The positive communications, owing to which Demipho's discovery became complete and absolutely certain, had to come from Phormio and Phaedria, who could not appear before the final act. That act began with Phormio's entry in verse 829. The entr'acte had above all a structural significance, because it separated the *anagnorisis* from the ultimate development. But it was justified by Demipho's wish to enter his house at last.

Terence has preserved the first 5 scenes of this final act. Only little has been changed therein, it seems, and these changes are of little importance, apart from what was pointed out above about verses 866, 872, 873 and 877 [2]. Yet there are some details to which I wish to draw the reader's attention. In 829 Phormio enters (from the left) in order to postpone the carrying out of his promises of marriage by means of a lie. Although officially he has only to do with Demipho, yet he talks about "the old men" [3]. Why? In order to explain his action. Apparently he walked half stage at

[1]) See pp. 69 f.

[2]) It is possible that between 865 and 866 Apollodorus had Sophrona's expulsion mentioned. If one holds that after Sophrona had entered the house in 765 Chremes must have informed the audience about his plans against her, verse 865 cannot be authentic either, because in this case Chremes had not been "led into the house" by Sophrona, as it says in this verse.

[3]) Verses 832, 837.

first, hesitating as to whether he should knock at Demipho's door or at Chremes's. The purpose is transparent. While he is standing there, Antipho could not but see him from the alley and could come forward [1]. The two remain talking on the same spot. Immediately afterwards, in verse 841, Geta comes out of the house on the left and, after a few lines of monologue overheard by the others, wishes to run away to the left, in order to go to the *leno,* because he must fetch Antipho [2]. Although he has higly important news of his own,—his master has ordered him to look for Antipho [3]. We now know what was Demipho's intention in Apollodorus's play. He wished to ask the boy as soon as possible whence the little box came which he had handed to Sophrona. Therefore Antipho, who entered the house at verse 883, as is seen in Terence's text, could tell Demipho during verses 884—893, that Phaedria had given him the little box.

In the last [4] of the 5 scenes mentioned Demipho obtained unsought the information which made his discovery complete. For Phormio finds himself compelled to betray impudently to Nausistrata that he has cheated Chremes of 30 *minae,* which have been spent to redeem Phaedria's little friend [5]. That settled the matter for Demipho, though he would certainly not omit to ascertain fully whether that friend was a foundling and had her box of valuables with her when she was found. There is something else in this scene which attracts our attention: in Terence's play Chremes's nervousness suffices to convince Nausistrata that Phormio's accusations are true, although he is a perfect stranger to her and gives an impression of utter unreliability. In my opinion Nausistrata's ready belief in such a staggering accusation can only be understood if she had entertained a bad suspicion even before. Terence had been unable to create more than her wonder and astonishment at the sudden change in Demipho and Chremes with regard to Phanium [6].

[1] Verse 833: Sed Phormiost.
[2] Verses 844—47.
[3] Verse 881.
[4] Verses 990—1055.
[5] Verse 1038.
[6] Verse 806: Miror, quid siet.

But in the Greek play she had moreover concluded that the mysterious stranger, who had ejected Sophrona from Demipho's house, and sent her away from Phanium, could be nobody else but her husband himself. Later, at home, she found an opportunity to draw out the *Nutrix* carefully. Even though that good soul would not have disclosed anything of what she had promised to keep silent [1]), yet we may safely say that Nausistrata, when Phormio called her outside, all but burst with suspicion. For this Nausistrata then it was not difficult, after Phormio's disclosures, to understand that "Chremes's daughter in Lemnos" [2]) was no longer in Lemnos, but in Athens, in Demipho's house, as Antipho's wife. In Terence's play she cannot have been aware of that, and there is nobody who tells her [3]).

In the deleted conclusion of the *Epidikazomenos* a few words may perhaps have been exchanged about Phanium, but it was no doubt chiefly concerned with Pamphila. When reading the last 13 lines of the comedy in Terence's text, we see that: in the first place a means is looked for and found to make Phaedria enter the stage [4]), 2ndly reason bids Chremes to withdraw into the house [5]), 3rdly Phormio obligingly rushes away [6]), so that 4thly Demipho and Nausistrata are left behind together [7]). On this situation, it seems to me, a reconstruction of the missing final scenes may be based. Whereas in the *Phormio* it was hardly possible for Demipho to do anything else but either run home resolutely, along the whole breadth of the stage, or join Nausistrata when entering Chremes's

[1]) See verses 742, 764—65.

[2]) Cf. verses 1004—7. In Lemno uxorem duxit... et inde filiam suscepit.

[3]) See **14**, p. 67.

[4]) Verses 1044—46, 1054—55.

[5]) What else could he do but slink off quietly? After 1048 he has no further rôle. See note 7.

[6]) Verse 1055.

[7]) See verses 1054—55. Phorm. Eamus intro hinc. Naus. Fiat: sed ubist Phaedria, iudex noster. This is how the *codex Bembinus* puts it. The other *codices* have Demipho say the first words, and have Chremes give the answer. The editors choose from the 4 given possibilities that which they think the most probable. If Terence has followed Apollodorus here, the *Bembinus* is certainly right. Phormio wishes to have a meal at once, but is sent to Phaedria by Nausistrata.

house, which would have been an easy but aimless exit, he must have requested her in the Greek play to stay outside for a while to listen to him. Thus he could communicate his discovery to her: that he had found the track of his lost daughter, who, unless all signs failed, was redeemed as Phaedria's beloved from Dorio with the money furnished by Chremes. And as Nausistrata indisputably called the tune in Chremes's household, it was possible for Demipho to arrange with her that the children were to be married if through Phaedria's evidence he was assured that the girl was indeed his daughter, so that he could acknowledge and accept her. We may expect that Nausistrata relinquished her intention to appoint Phaedria as Chremes's judge, but that on the other hand she has not belied her financial talent [1]) and has reminded Demipho of the fact that h e r 30 *minae* had been paid for h i s daughter and that a woman ought to have a dowry. But this scene cannot have been very extensive, for Phaedria had no more reason to linger than to hurry. Having answered all the questions put by his mother and his uncle, regarding the girl herself and her property, to the satisfaction of both, Demipho could tell him who she was; so that the play ended in the manner which we know, with the official engagement.

In the above investigation I have in the first place pointed out, on the ground of the restored division of the acts, that Terence when writing his *Phormio* has abridged the *Epidikazomenos* in the 4th act. Next I have tried by means of an analysis of the action and of the theme to determine more accurately the parts which has been abridged, and at the same time to point out the changes which the adapted theme must have undergone under his hands. Finally I have reconstructed from the traces preserved that part of the original theme which he has put on one side, and sketched how this must have been developed by the Greek poet together with and by the side of the part which in Terence's play has remained intact. The breech-block of my argument was the reconstruction of Pamphila's complete life-story. For Terence the abridgment of

[1]) See verses 788 ff.

that history was the starting-point, and this abridgment not only led him of its own accord to the cuts pointed out above, but the latter in their turn compelled him to change what he had kept, and that at one important point: the way in which Chremes's fatherhood was discovered by Phormio and his associates.

Just as Terence treated all the other plays which he adapted, so he did the *Epidikazomenos*: first of all he deleted the preliminary disclosure by the deity; thus Phanium's and Pamphila's previous history disappeared. And because the identity of Demipho's daughter had been discovered exclusively by inanimate *gnorismata,* private inquiry and implied conclusions, the inevitable and logical result of that expunction was that he had to delete her *anagnorisis.* It may be assumed that this result was not unwelcome to him. *Adelphi, Hecyra* and *Eunuchus* prove that the rehabilitation of girls living under circumstances like Pamphila's, did not seem very acceptable to him or his Roman audience or both. And from the *Andria* it appears even more clearly than from his other comedies that he by no means liked such means of recognition as rings and clothes, which the Greeks frequently used [1]. All the passages and all the scenes which referred to the *anagnorisis* had therefore to be deleted, including 1stly the scene in which the little box of Pamphila's valuables delivered by Antipho passed into Sophrona's hands, and 2ndly that part of the following scene where Demipho took it from the *Nutrix.* The result was that it was no longer possible for the adaptator to give a faithful copy of the way in which Apollodorus brought about Chremes's exposure. As long as Antipho did not learn, and could not tell Geta afterwards, that Stilpo-who-was-not-Stilpo had expelled the *Nutrix,* Geta was not able to understand that Stilpo was really Chremes, so that he could not possibly gauge the profound truth in the lie of the overheard interview with Phanium: "your father was called Stilpo, I am his blood-relation". Therefore Terence cut the knot: he had Chremes tell Phanium the entire truth, before Geta's stealthy ears.

By this change Terence has considerably injured the finely-calculated plot, which was really a mental treat for an intelligent

[1]) Cf. *Gr. Orig. en Lat. Navolg.* pp. 113 ff.

audience. When for the sake of his dramatic and other principles he sacrificed Pamphila's *anagnorisis* together with the monologue of the god, he robbed Antipho's character of its only congenial trait [1]), made Sophrona's characterization superficial and took away the moralizing tendency from Demipho's characterization. Finally he obscured the real meaning of the play, for the idea was that the loss of money should appear to be gain for the loser. But in my opinion we should not say that he altogether spoilt the Greek play by his abridgments. This is by no means the case. Not merely because he preserved much, but because of the mediocre value of the deleted part. On surveying the contents of the *Epidikazomenos* one cannot remain blind to certain imperfections. Between the *anagnorisis* of Pamphila and that of Phanium there was no inner relation, there was nothing or very little of that interaction in which the one motif supports the other and is urged on by it. Consequently this play lacked in its double action the unity of Menander's *Adelphoi* and the concentration of his *Eunouchos*. The cause must be that the two young women, the tranquil focuses of the play, did not stand in any relation to each other. We even get the impression that the Greek poet has felt this shortcoming and tried to counteract it by accentuating the mutual devotion of Phaedria and Antipho, by having Davos inquire again, on purpose, after Phaedria's chance of success, at the end of the exposition [2]), and by making Demipho speak casually, it would seem, of his expelled daughter [3]). But it is not probable that he will thus have succeeded in enhancing the interest of the audience in Pamphila's fate. The fact that she is Demipho's daughter remains something additional, something invented on second thoughts. And therefore it is not to be considered as a serious evil, from a dramatic point of view, that through the *Phormio* she will continue to live as Phaedria's mistress, not as his wife. Moreover, lovers, **ἀθάναται καὶ ἀγήραοι ἤματα πάντα,** are privileged in literature over legal partners as to eternal life and eternal youth.

[1]) See p. 70.
[2]) Verse 140.
[3]) Donatus ad versum 647.

ACTS AND SCENES OF APOLLODORUS'S HEKYRA

The house of Laches is on the right, from the spectator's point of view, the house of Phidippus on the left, Bacchis's house in the street to the left of the stage. See p. 18 note 1.

Act I. Terence 58—197; + x verses. See p. 7.

1. Philotis — Syra, Ter. 58—75. See pp. 36 f.
2. Parmeno — Philotis — Syra, Ter. 76—197. See pp. 8, 11, 36 ff., 41.

<3. Exposition of the god, x verses>. See pp. 7, 33, 38, 40, 47 f.

Act II. Terence 198—449 a. See pp. 11 ff.

1. Laches — Sostrata, Ter. 198—242.
2. Phidippus — Laches — Sostrata, Ter. 243—273.
3. Sostrata, Ter. 274—280.

   (1–3:) See pp. 11 ff., 15.

4. Pamphilus — Parmeno — (Myrrina), Ter. 281—335. See pp. 11 ff., 42.
5. Sostrata — Parmeno — Pamphilus, Ter. 336—360, (*prodit* Pamph. 353, *exit* Sostr. 358, *exit* Parm. 360). See pp. 15, 16.
6. Pamphilus, Ter. 361—414. See pp. 42, 48.
7. Parmeno — Sosia — Pamphilus, Ter. 415—449 a, (*exit* Sos. 429, *exit* Parm. 443, *exit* Pamph. 449 a). See pp. 8, 15 ff.

Act III. Terence 451—724; cf. 727—798. See pp. 13 ff., 18.

1. Laches — Phidippus — Pamphilus, Ter. 451—515, (*exit* Pamph. 495). See pp. 15 ff.
2. Myrrina — Phidippus, Ter. 516—576, (*prodit* Phid. 522, *exit* 565). See pp. 11, 14 f., 18, 34, 39 ff.
3. Sostrata — Pamphilus, Ter. 577—606. See p. 19.
4. Laches — Sostrata — Pamphilus, Ter. 607—622, (*exit* Sostr. 612). See p. 19.

5. Phidippus — Laches — Pamphilus, Ter. 623—724, (*exit* Pamph. 705). See pp. 14, 18, 19 ff.
6. Bacchis — Laches — Phidippus, Ter. 727—752, 771—785, 754—767a, 788—790, 792, 793a, 794—798, (*exit* Bacch. 793a). See pp. 11, 14, 17—25, 33, 37, 44.

Act IV. Terence 799—810, 813—815; cf. 816—842; + x verses. See pp. 14, 25—35, 39—45.

1. Parmeno — Bacchis, Ter. 799—810, 813—815. See pp. 25, 26, 29, 30, 32.
2. Bacchis, cf. Ter. 816—821. See pp. 26, 29, 33, 44.
3. Pamphilus — Parmeno — Bacchis, cf. Ter. 841 ff. (*exit* Parm.); cf. Ter. 822 ff.; <+ x verses>. See pp. 10, 25—43, 47 ff.

<4. Bacchis — Phidippus — Nutrix, x verses>. See pp. 25, 44—45.

Act V. x verses. See pp. 8—10, 25—26, 39, 45 ff.

<1. Laches — Pamphilus, x verses>. See pp. 25, 39, 45—46.

<2. Phidippus — Myrrina — (Laches), x verses>. See pp. 39, 45, 46.

<3. Laches — Phidippus — Myrrina, x verses>. See pp. 39, 46.

<4. Laches — Myrrina — Bacchis, x verses>. See pp. 39, 46.

ACTS AND SCENES OF APOLLODORUS'S EPIDIKAZOMENOS

The house of Chremes is on the right, from the spectator's point of view, Demipho's on the left; Dorio's house is in the street to the left of the stage and so is Phormio's, but a little farther on. See pp. 55—56.

Act I. Terence 35—152; + x verses. See pp. 51 f., 56 ff.
1. Davos, Ter. 35—50. See p. 56.
2. Geta — Davos, Ter. 51—152. See pp. 50 f., 74 f., 81, 94.
<3. Exposition of the god, x verses>. See pp. 51 f., 81 ff., 92 ff.

Act II. Terence 153—463. See pp. 56 ff.
1. Antipho — Phaedria, Ter. 153—178. See pp. 61, 66, 68.
2. Geta — Antipho — Phaedria, Ter. 179—230. See p. 56.
3. Demipho — Geta — Phaedria, Ter. 231—310; cf. 311—314; + x verses, (*exit* Phaedria 310, *exit* Geta 310). See pp. 58, 60 f., 66, 68.
4. Phormio — Geta, Ter. 315—347. See pp. 56, 58, 59 f., 66, 68.
5. Demipho — (Advocati —) Geta — Phormio, Ter. 348—440. See pp. 51, 61.
6. Demipho — Geta — Advocati, Ter. 441—463, (*exeunt* Adv. 458, *exit* Dem. 462, *exit* Geta 463). See pp. 66, 68.

Act III. Terence 465—727 a. See pp. 56 ff., 59, 61 f., 65.
1. Geta — Antipho, cf. Ter. 465—484. See pp. 61 f., 66, 68.
2. Phaedria — Dorio — Antipho — Geta, Ter. 485—566, (*exit* Dorio 533, *exit* Ant. 565, *exeunt* Geta et Phaedria 566). See pp. 55 f., 61 f.
3. Demipho — Chremes, Ter. 567—590. See pp. 51, 63, 66 f., 68, 72 f., 75.
4. Geta — (Demipho — Chremes), Ter. 591—605. See p. 63 f.
5. Antipho — Geta — Chremes — Demipho. Ter. 606—712, (*exeunt* Dem. et Chrem. 681, *exit* Ant. 712). See pp. 64, 71, 81 f.
6. Demipho — Geta — Chremes, Ter. 713—727 a. See pp. 59, 62, 64 f.

Act **IV**. Terence 727b—783; cf. 820—828; + x verses; 784—795a + x verses; 795—819 + x verses. See pp. 56 ff, 59, 65, 85, 89.

1. Chremes — Sophrona, cf. Ter. 727b—765. See pp. 64 f., 67, 73 f., 78, 89.
2. Demipho — Geta, Ter. 766—783, (*exit* Dem. 777). See pp. 65 f., 67, 72, 78.

<3. Antipho — Sophrona, cf. Ter. 820—828; + x verses>. See pp. 67, 70 ff., 76, 77 ff., 84 ff., 93.

4. Demipho — Nausistrata — <Sophrona>, Ter. 784—795a + x verses, (*exeunt* Nausistr. et Sophr.). See pp. 67, 69, 79, 86 ff., 89.
5. Chremes — Demipho — Nausistrata, Ter. 795b—819 + x verses, (*prodit* Nausistr. 797, *exit* 815, *exit* Chrem. 819). See pp. 60, 67, 69 f., 79, 89.

Act **V**. Terence 829—1055 + x verses. See pp. 56 ff., 59, 66, 89.

1. Phormio — Antipho, cf. Ter. 829—840. See pp. 71 f., 89 f.
2. Geta — Antipho — Phormio, cf. Ter. 841—883. See pp. 67, 71, 75 ff., 89 f., 93.
3. Phormio, Ter. 884—893. See p. 90.
4. Demipho — Chremes — Phormio, Ter. 894—989.
5. Nausistrata — Chremes — Phormio — Demipho, Ter. 990—1055, (*exit* Chrem. 1048, *exit* Phorm. 1055). See pp. 67, 74, 90 f.

<6. Demipho — Nausistrata, x verses>. See pp. 91 f., 94.

<7. Nausistrata — Phaedria — Demipho, x verses>. See pp. 85, 89, 91 f.

PA3870.A94K9
Two comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus
3 1795 10145 4872

INDEX LOCORUM

(The numbers of the verses are in italics)

Hecyra:

58 2, 8, 38, *58—59* 36, *58—75,* 18, *58—197* 11, *59* 8, *60* 8, 18, *60—62* 37, *81* 18, *87* 37, *97—100* 37, *97 ff.* 38, *98* 18,

114—170 7, 8, *116* 8, *121* 8, *123* 8, *124* 8, *134* 8, *157* 36, *158—159* 36, *164—172* 41, *164—173* 43, *171* 41, *173* 42, *174* 8, *179* 8, *188* 8, *191* 8, *195* 18, *197* 11, *198* 12, *198—242* 15, *198—280* 11, 13, *198—448* 15,

214 2, *243* 12, *243—280* 15, *244—245* 46, *246* 18, *247—250* 46, *271* 46, *273* 15, 18, *273—280* 12, *280* 11, 13, 14, *280—281* 12, 13, *281—335* 15, *281—576* 12, *283* 42, *286* 2,

314—326 42, *327* 8, *336—414* 15, *358* 16, *359—360* 8, *361 ff.* 42, *369—370* 42, *376* 42, *378 ff.* 42, *380* 2, *392* 42, *393* 41, 43, *393—394* 41, *394* 42, 43, *397—400* 43,

409—414 8, *415—448* 15, *430—443* 8, *432* 26, *443* 26, *443—799* 8, *448* 16, *448—451* 15, *449* 17, *449—450* 16, *451* 14, 15, 16, 17, *451—456* 17, *451—515* 18, *451—798* 17, 18, 65, *451 ff.* 16, *452—454* 16—17, *453* 17, *455* 17, *458 ff.* 41, *466—467* 82, *495* 16, 25,

509 14, *515* 11, 14, 17, *516* 14, *516—518* 15, *516—576* 19, *527—531* 42, *529—531* 42, *531* 42, *553—556* 37, *555* 37, *572—574* 7, *573—574* 40, *574* 7, 31, 34, *576* 14, 15, 17, *577* 15, 16, *577—606* 19, *577—798* 12,

606 18, *606—607* 18, *607—622* 19, *622* 18, *622—623* 18, *623 ff.* 19, *628* 82, *631* 43, *633* 82, *634* 82, *639* 82, *642 ff.* 43, *648—649* 82, *653* 82, *667* 46, *670—671* 82, *685* 37, 38,

701—705 82, *705* 25, *715* 20, *716—718* 20, *719* 21, *720* 18, *721* 20, *721—724* 20, *725* 19, 20, *725—726* 19, 20, *726* 11, 14, 18, 19, 20,

727 18, 20, *727—752* 21—22, *727—798* 19, 20, *727 ff.* 19, *729* 18, *731* 21, *734—735* 36, *735* 38, *746* 38, *748—749* 33, *752* 24, 36, *753* 24, *753—755* 21, *753—787* 23—24, *754,* 24, *756* 38, *756 ff.* 36, *761* 46, *761—767* 21, *764* 46, *766* 46, *767 a* 24, *767* 18, 19, 21, *767—769* 45, *767—798* 20, *767 b—770* 24, *771 b* 24, *771—785* 22—23, 24, *773* 37, *775—776* 36, *780—782* 25, *786—787* 24, *788* 24, *788—798* 24, *791* 24, *793* 27, 28, 37, *793 b* 24, *794—798* 11, *798* 11, 14, 18, 19, 25, *798—799* 11, 29, *799* 11, 12, 26, 29, *799—806* 11, *799—810* 28, 29, *799—864* 26 *799—880* 12, 14,

806 28, 29, *806—807* 26, *809* 26, 31, 45, *810* 29, *811—812* 7, 26, 29, 31, 32, *815* 29, *816* 29, *816 ff.* 36, *821* 27, *822* 27, 29, 31, 33, 42, *822—829* 28, *822—832* 7, *822 ff.* 29, 33, *823* 31, *823 ff.* 34, *824—825* 27, *825* 10, 12, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, *828—829* 34, *830* 12, 28, *830—831* 28, *831* 32, 34, 38, *834—836* 38, *834 ff.* 36, *845* 32, *845—846* 26, *855—864* 30, *865—867* 25, *866—867* 9, 47, *869—871* 10, *870—871* 24.

Phormio:

35 56, *35—230* 57, *35—314* 57, *35—727* 65, *69—70* 83, *80—90* 81, *81* 81, *82* 81, *84* 83, *85—86* 81, *91 ff.* 50, 66, *94* 75,

112—116 75, *114—115* 53, 76, *120—121* 83, *125—126* 66, *140* 94, *152* 56, 57, *153* 52, 59, 66, *177* 55, 61, *179* 56, *194* 56, *194—195* 55, *198 ff.* 68,

215—218 56, *218* 56, *230* 57, *231* 56, 66, *231—464* 57, *235—238* 66, *236* 66, *237* 66, *241—246* 84, *243—244* 84, *262* 83, *266—269* 70, *279—281* 66, *292 ff.* 66, *298* 66, 83,

302—303 83, *305* 66, *307* 66, *309* 56, *309—310* 56, *310* 56, 82, *311—314* 58, 60, *314* 56, 57, 58, 59, *315* 56, 61, *315—345* 66, *315—347* 58, 59, *315—566* 57, *339* 60, *348* 56, *348 ff.* 61, *358* 83, *389—390* 51,

440 56, 61, *458* 56, *460—461* 64, *460—462* 61, 66, 68, *462* 56, *463* 61, 68, *463—465* 61, *464* 57, 61, *465* 56, 59, 61, 66, *465—484* 61, *465—566* 57, *465—727* 62, 65, *465 ff.* 62, *480—481* 66, *480—483* 64, *482* 68, *484* 56, *484—486* 56, *485* 56, 61,

513 81, *520* 81, *523 ff.* 81, *533* 56, *553—556* 62, *562* 63, *566* 56, 57, 58, 63, *566—567* 58, 62, 63, *567* 56, 57, 64, *567—568* 51, *567—576* 66, *567—590* 67, *567—727* 57 *567—765* 57, *567 ff.* 66, 73, *568* 68, *569—572* 75, *569 ff.* 52, *571* 75, *577 ff.* 66, 67, *591* 56, 63, *594* 63, *598—599* 71, 72,

606 64, *608—610* 82, *642—644* 82, *645—647* 82, *646* 83, *647* 94, *663—664* 83, *669* 83, *699—711* 70,

712 71, 72, 86, *713 ff.* 72, *727 a* 65, *727* 56 57, 59, 64, 65, *727—827* 86, *727 b—765* 66, *727 b—1055* 65, *728* 59, 62, 64, 68, *728—1055* 57, *728 ff.* 73, *730—731* 75, *733* 75, *740 ff.* 67, *742* 74, 91, *744* 73, *744—746* 73, *747* 51, *751—753* 75, *757 ff.* 82, *762—763* 74, *763* 88, *764* 67, *764—765* 74, 91, *765* 57, 58, 64, 67, 76, 78, 89, *766* 56, 65, *766—777* 86, *766—783* 72, *766—893* 57, *769* 83, *777* 78, *783* 67, 72, 77, 78, 79, 84, 86, 87, *784* 87, *784—785* 87, *784—795 a* 87, 88, *784—819* 72, 86, *786* 87, *788 ff.* 92, *792—794* 67, *793—794* 87, *795 a* 77, 79, 88, *795* 67, 69, 84, 86, 88, *795 b* 69, 89, *795—796* 67, *795—819* 89, *795 b—797* 88, *797* 67, 69, 79, 86,

806 90, *811—812* 73, *814—815* 87, *815* 67, 88, *819* 67, 69, 75, 86, *820* 56, 59, 66, 67, 70, 77, 79, *820—825* 78, *824—825* 70, *826* 80, *826—827* 70, *827—828* 70, 80, *828* 80, *829* 56, 59, 66, 71, 89, *830* 71, *831* 71, *832* 89, *833* 72, 90, *835* 80, *837* 71, 89, *841* 71, 90, *844—847* 90, *847* 71, *861 ff.* 76, *865* 89, *865—866* 89, *866* 76, 89, *869 ff.* 75, *872* 76, 77, 89, *872—873* 67, 76, *873* 67, 76, 89, *877* 67, 77, 78, 89, *881* 90, *883* 90, *884—893* 90, *891* 64, 72, 87, *894* 85, *894—1055* 57, *897—899* 83,

940—941 76, *955* 83, *990—1055* 90,

1004—1005 76, *1004—1007* 91, *1012—1013* 74, *1015* 56, *1017* 75, *1017—1018* 67, 74, 76, *1038* 90, *1043—1055* 91, *1044—1046* 91, *1048* 91, *1054—1055* 91, *1055* 91.